KINGSHIP IN CEYLON

From the Fourth to the Tenth Century A.D.

Sujatha Gunasena

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of London
1974

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ABSTRACT

The present study is an attempt to examine the institution of kingship in Ceylon from the fourth to the tenth century A.D. A brief survey of the political background of the period is included in the first chapter as a prerequisite to the understanding of the various stages of the evolution of the concept of kingship in Ceylon; the rest of this chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of the sources utilized in this study. The second chapter deals with the various titles, throne names and personal names used by the kings of this period, in the discussion of which we have analysed the various factors that led to their selection, particularly the underlying religious and political significance of the titles and their importance with respect to the growth of kingly power. The royal family and the part played by its members in the administration of the country are taken into consideration in chapter III. An attempt has been made in this chapter to analyse the correlation of the three titles, uparāja, yuvarāja and mahādipāda. Chapter IV is devoted to a discussion of the royal consecration. It discusses the new elements and rites associated with the abhiṣeka ceremony of the period under review, its political and religious significance and the disparity between the theoretical and the actual ceremony. This also attempts to clarify certain points of special

significance, which in some instances have been repeatedly misunderstood. This is followed by a chapter on the nature of kingship. The concepts relating to rulership, their significance and how far these concepts actually affected practice are taken into consideration in this chapter. The next chapter deals with the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha, particular attention being paid to the causes that led to the development of a close connexion between them and the impact of that connexion on the evolution of kingship in Ceylon. Three appendices are included in this work to elucidate some of the points discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was undertaken under the guidance of Dr. J. G. de Casparis, and no words of mine can adequately express my deep gratitude to him. I have benefited a great deal from his valuable comments and criticisms which have certainly led to an improvement in the quality of this thesis. The generous manner in which he gave me both of his time and of his expert knowledge of the subject throughout, is deeply appreciated. Encouragement was never lacking from him. He has been teacher, counsellor and friend all at once. I could not have been more fortunate than to have studied under him. To Dr. de Casparis, therefore, I remain deeply indebted.

I should also like to express my deep gratitude and sincere thanks to Professor K. W. Goonewardhana, Head of the Department of History, University of Sri Lanka, Peradeniya Campus and Dr. Lakshman S. Perera, Senior Education Officer, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, for their kind help, advice and encouragement.

It was Dr. Sirima Kiribamune, Senior Lecturer in History, University of Sri Lanka, Peradeniya Campus, who awakened my interest in this field of study, and my most sincere thanks go to her. I am also greatly thankful to

Betty O'Grady and Rachel Rymaszewski for their kind help.

I owe my sincere thanks to the staff of the libraries of the School of Oriental and African Studies, the British Museum and the University of London for all their help and assistance.

I am equally grateful to the University of Sri Lanka, Peradeniya Campus, for granting me the study leave necessary for carrying out this research and to the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, for awarding me a Governing Body award during the final stages of my study.

Finally, it remains for me to express my sincere and heart-felt thanks to my husband, Sena, who spared no pains in helping me with my work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A.B.	..	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
A.I.C.	..	Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon
A.N.	..	Aṅguttara Nikāya
Ap.	..	Āpastamba Dharmasūtra
A.S.C.	..	Archaeological Survey of Ceylon
A.S.C.A.R.	..	Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Report
A.S.C.M.	..	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon
B.E.F.E.O.	..	Bulletin de L'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient
C.A.L.R.	..	The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register
C.C.M.T.	..	Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times
C.J.Sc.	..	Ceylon Journal of Science
C.I.I.	..	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum
Cv.	..	Cūḷavaṁsa
D.N.	..	Dīgha Nikāya
Dv.	..	Dīpavaṁsa

E.I.	..	Epigraphia Indica
E.Z.	..	Epigraphia Zeylanica
Hir.	..	Hiraṇyakeśi
J.A.O.S.	..	Journal of the American Oriental Society
J.P.T.S.	..	Journal of the Pali Text Society
J.R.A.S.	..	The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
J.R.A.S.C.B.	..	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch
K.S.	..	Kauśītakī Saṁhitā
Mbh.	..	Mahābhārata
M.S.	..	Maitrī Saṁhitā
Mv.	..	Mahāvaṁsa
n.s.	..	new series
P.T.S.	..	Pali Text Society
S.B.	..	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
S.B.E.	..	The Sacred Books of the East
S.H.B.	..	Simon Hewavitarane Bequest Series
S.P.	..	Śānti Parvan
T.B.	..	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
T.S.	..	Taittirīya Saṁhitā

U.C.R.	..	University of Ceylon Review
U.H.C.	..	University of Ceylon History of Ceylon
Vpk.	..	Vaṁsatthappakāsinī

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND SOURCES

According to the Mahāvaṁsa, it appears that in Ceylon monarchy was the state norm from the very beginning of its civilization. However, the authentic history of the Island begins with the reign of Devānampiya Tissa. The account of the Mahāvaṁsa prior to the reign of this ruler is based mainly on legends, myths and Jātaka stories. Hence it cannot be said with certainty what form of government prevailed in the Island before the reign of Devānampiya Tissa. Moreover, it is not justifiable to assume that monarchy was the only form of government prevailing in Ceylon from the very outset merely because it has been stated by the chronicler. There are some suggestions of a republican form of government at the time of the first Āryan settlements in Ceylon,[2] but insufficient data are available to ascertain the conditions prevailing in that

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 45-50.

2. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S., 1936, pp. 443-462; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 227.

remote past. Although it is not unlikely that there had been some kind of tribal form of government among the first Āryan settlers of the Island, these early republican ideas never developed or flourished in Ceylon. From the earliest times to which our available records, both literary and monumental, go back, the government of the Island has been of the monarchic type.

In a monarchic state, as the name implies, the king becomes the soul of the body politic who represents the state. According to the Hindu conception, rājya or state consists of seven elements (aṅgas or prakṛtis),[1] and apparently the king or svāmin is regarded as the most important of all.[2] Kauṭilya observes in one place that rājā rājyamiti prakṛtisaṁkṣepaḥ, that is, the prakṛtis in epitome mean 'the king is the state'.[3] The king, therefore, is the pivot around which the political,

---

1. The seven constituents of a state are svāmin 'the sovereign'; amātya 'the officials'; janapada 'the territory and the population; durga 'the capital or fortified city'; kośa 'the treasury'; daṇḍa 'the army'; mitra 'friends and allies' (Arthaśāstra, VI, chap.I; VIII, chap. I; Manu, IX, 295; Nītisāra, canto IV, v. 1; see also D. R. Bhandarkar, Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, p. 65; U. N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, pp. 84-86.

2. John W. Spellman, Political Theory of Ancient India, p.

3. Arthaśāstra, ed. R. Shamasastry, VIII (1924), p. 325; D. R. Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 84.

religious, social and economic institutions of a country revolve. Hence, for a proper understanding of the history of the Island - political as well as religious, social and economic - a knowledge of the institution of kingship is indispensable.

In his doctoral thesis, Tilak Hettiarachchy investigated the history of kingship from the earliest times up to the reign of Mahāsena (274-301), and this work has recently been published. The scope of our thesis covers the period from the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328), the successor of Mahāsena, to that of Mahinda V (982-1029). The reign of Mahinda V is significant in the history of the Island; it marked the end of the Anurādhapura kingdom which had lasted for more than a millennium. In contrast to the fulsome eulogies bestowed on Mahinda V in the Polonnaruva Pillar Inscription,[1] he appears from the chronicles to have been a weak and incapable ruler. Says the Cūḷavaṁsa, 'As he wandered from the path of statecraft and was of very weak character, the peasants did not deliver him his share of the produce. As the king in his tenth year had entirely lost his fortune, he was unable to satisfy his troops by giving them their pay'.

---

1. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 59.

2. Cv., chap. 55, vv. 3-4.

At this turn of events Mahinda V abandoned Rājaraṭṭha and fled to Rohaṇa. Thus the Anurādhapura kingdom was abandoned to disorder in 992 A.D., the tenth year of his reign, and the troops, Sinhalese as well as Keraḷas and Kaṇṇāṭas, took control of it. The Coḷas, taking advantage of this situation, invaded the Island and brought it under their authority.[1] The inefficient rule of Mahinda V thus paved the way for the Coḷas to establish their authority over the Island. For the first time, Ceylon became the province of an empire with its centre outside the Island and was administered in the interests of that empire. The Coḷas held sway over Ceylon for over three quarters of a century and this resulted in bringing many changes in the political, administrative, social and cultural spheres.[2]

The Coḷa occupation of Ceylon was brought to an end in the year 1070 A.D. by Vijayabāhu I who succeeded in liberating the Island from their power. With the accession of Vijayabāhu a new kingdom emerged with its

---

1. Cv., chap. 55, vv. 13-20; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 344-351.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 344-351; W. M. K. Wijetunga, 'The Rise and Decline of Cola Power in Ceylon' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1962), pp. 234-236, 289-302; 302-340.

capital at Polonnaruva. Following the example of the Coḷas he fixed his seat of government at Polonnaruva,[1] and thereafter Anurādhapura never regained its position as the capital of the Island. The political background of the Polonnaru period differs to a considerable extent from that of Anurādhapura.[2] During this period, the political, religious and social institutions underwent significant changes. New ideas, beliefs and customs emerged around the king, and in contrast to the period under survey the royalty of this period came under the influence of Hinduism and Brāhmanical rites.[3] Therefore, a study of the institution of kingship in the Polonnaru period can be attempted only in a separate study. For these reasons the abandonment of Anurādhapura as the capital of the Sinhalese is taken as the terminus ad quem of this study.

No study of the institution of kingship in Ceylon during the period under survey has been undertaken, apart from a few papers on some aspects which have appeared in

---

1. Cv., chap. 59, vv. 8-11.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. II, pp. 507-525; Amaradasa Liyanagamage, The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Dambadeniya, pp. 34-75.

3. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. II, pp. 534-535; W. M. K. Wijetunga, op. cit., p. 297.

journals. In a paper published in 1952 in the Ceylon Historical Journal, W. A. Jayawardana discussed in brief some aspects of kingship and the administration in Ceylon from the fourth to the sixth century A.D. In his paper on 'The Royal Lineage in the Praśastis of the 8th - 10th century Inscriptions' published in 1953 in the Ceylon Historical Journal, Laksman S. Perera examined the ideas current at the time about the lineage and descent of the kings. Paranavitana's article in the Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume gives an outline of the political and social conditions of medieval Ceylon. In 1960, Heinz Bechert brought out a posthumous publication of a study by Wilhelm Geiger on the Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times. This work contains a section on 'King and Government' in which Geiger brings together the relevant material found in the Pāli chronicles. In addition to the works mentioned above, there are some unpublished monographs which have some bearing on the institution of kingship in the period under review. Of these, The Institutions of Ancient Ceylon from Inscriptions from the third to the tenth century A.D. by Lakshman S. Perera, a doctoral thesis presented to the University of Ceylon, is of particular importance. But, unfortunately we did

not get the opportunity of consulting this work in detail while the present study was being carried out. In his doctoral thesis on The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha, R. A. L. H. Gunawardana examines the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha. Though it was beyond the scope of these works to make a detailed examination of the institution of kingship, they form a sound basis for further research and bring out many problems which are of interest.

For the sake of convenience, the early history of Ceylon is divided into two parts, the early Anurādhapura and the later Anurādhapura period. The period that covers our study is generally referred to as the later Anurādhapura period. Basically, the political concepts and administrative institutions of the early Anurādhapura period remained unchanged during the period under review. Therefore, in our study we have taken into consideration mainly the problems that need special attention.

A brief survey of the political background of the period is necessary for a proper understanding of the various stages of the evolution of kingship. Our study begins with the accession of Sirimeghavaṇṇa, a scion of

the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty founded by Vasabha, and the same line of rulers continued in power up to the reign of Mahānāma (406-428). Then followed a period of political confusion and chaos in the country. A Tamil named Paṇḍu, who probably took advantage of this situation, invaded the Island and seized the throne.[1] The invasion of Paṇḍu imposed foreign rule on Ceylon for a little over a quarter of a century. After a period of great struggle, Dhātusena vanquished the Tamils who were in possession of Anurādhapura and ascended the throne in 455 A.D. Dhātusena's accession marked the establishment of the first Moriya dynasty in Ceylon.[2]

During the two centuries that followed the accession of Sirimeghavaṇṇa, no significant changes seem to have taken place in the political or in any other institution; the normal course of development of the institutions transplanted in the Island by the settlers from North India, some six centuries before the beginning of the Christian era, continued as in the period ending with Mahāsena.

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 11, 29-34.

2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 13-35.

The Moriya dynasty founded by Dhātusena became effete in the first half of the sixth century, and the Island went through a period of civil wars, in which the scions of the two royal families - Moriya and Lambakaṇṇa - fought with one another for the control of the Island. This period of dynastic instability which lasted for about a century and a half had, however, intervals of good government under kings like Aggabodhi I (571-604) and Aggabodhi II (604-614).[1]

Stable political conditions were restored by Mānavamma (684-718) whose reign opens a new chapter in the history of the Island. The dynasty of Mānavamma lasted for well over three centuries, and is the second longest in the Island's history. The long and effective exercise of power by Mānavamma and his successors gave the dynasty a sanctity and an authority which few of the dynasties before him possessed.

The three centuries which followed the accession of Mānavamma are of particular importance in the development of the concept of kingship in Ceylon. It was during this period of political stability and prosperity that

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 300-313; Cv., chap. 42, vv. 1-69.

new ideas, beliefs and customs emerged which added a sanctity to the position of the king.

Another characteristic feature of the political background of the period under survey is the close relationship between Ceylon and the South Indian kingdoms. As seen above, in the fifth century six Tamil rulers, probably from the Pāṇḍya country, held sway over the Island for about twenty-seven years. Another invasion from South India is recorded in the Cūḷavaṁsa in the reign of Sena I (833-853).[1] Many princes fled to South India when they were faced with political unrest in Ceylon and sought the aid of the South Indian rulers to achieve their aims.[2] As regards the Tamils themselves, by this time they were found in large numbers in Ceylon and formed part of the permanent population. Many of these were engaged in military and commercial activities.[3] The close relationship with South India was not without

---

1. Cv., chap. 50, vv. 12-42.

2. Cv., chap. 38, v. 86; chap. 39, v. 20; chap. 44, v. 94, v. 125, v. 152, v. 154; chap. 45, v. 13, v. 18; chap. 47, vv. 4-61; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 300-301, p. 312.

3. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 341-343.

an effect on the royalty of this period. The rulers of our period appear to have followed South Indian traditions and customs. The alternate use of the throne names can be cited as an example.[1]

* * * *

The sources pertaining to our study can be roughly divided into two categories, literary and archaeological. The former covers the chronicles, both Pāli and Sinhalese, and other literary works, and the latter the inscriptions and archaeological remains. Of the literary sources, the Cūḷavaṁsa, which is only another name for the continuation of the Mahāvaṁsa, is by far the most important work and figures as the foremost source of information for the present study. As its authorship, sources, contents and authenticity have already been adequately dealt with by

---

1. See pp. 65-67; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 365.

many scholars,[1] there is no need to go into details except for a brief survey. The comments made here are therefore confined to those chapters which are of special importance to us.

The Cūḷavaṁsa deals with the history of Ceylon from the accession of Sirimeghavaṇṇa to modern times. It has been pointed out that this long history was compiled in three parts and at different times by different authors.[2] The first part of the Cūḷavaṁsa covers the period up to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186) - chapter XXXVII to LXXIX -; the second part begins with the reign of Vijayabāhu II (1186-1187), the successor of Parākramabāhu I, and ends with that of Parākramabāhu IV (1302-1326) - chapter LXXX to XC -; the remaining chapters constitute the third part. Of these only the first part pertains to our study. It is generally believed that

---

1. Cv., vol. I, pp. I-VI; Cv., trans. Geiger, pp. IV-XIV; G. P. Malalasekera, Pali Literature of Ceylon, pp. 142, 215, 236; C. E. Godakumbura, 'The Cūḷavaṁsa', J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXXVIII (1949), pp. 123-126; S. Wickremasinghe, 'The Age of Parākramabāhu I' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958), pp. 8-33; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 51-53; Lakshman S. Perera, 'The Pali Chronicles of Ceylon', Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, ed. C. H. Philips, pp. 29-43.

2. Cv., vol. I, pp. II-VI; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 49, 51-53; G. C. Mendis, The Early History of Ceylon, pp. 117-122.

the first part of the Cūḷavaṁsa was compiled by a thera named Dhammakitti,[1] but some attribute this to another thera called Moggallāna who wrote the Abhidhānappadīpikā.[2] In this connexion, the discussion by Wickremasinghe of the authorship of the different parts of the Cūḷavaṁsa is particularly noteworthy.[3] She has demonstrated quite convincingly that chapters XXXVII to LXXIX, the first part of the Cūḷavaṁsa according to Geiger's view, were written by two different authors in two sections, one from the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa to the Coḷa conquest and the other from the rise of Vijayabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu I.[4] Although no division mark separating the two parts has been detected by Geiger, there is a marked difference in the treatment of 'the epic of Parakkama' from that of the previous rulers as shown by Wickremasinghe. And there is good reason to regard the first part as the work of a different author. It is not

---

1. Cv., vol. I, p. III.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 51.

3. S. Wickremasinghe, 'The Age of Parākramabāhu I' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958), see chapter on Sources.

4. S. Wickremasinghe, op. cit., pp. 12-13, 18-19.

unlikely, as she points out, that this part was compiled during the time of Coḷa occupation by scholars who had taken refuge in Rohaṇa. If this view is correct, it appears that the part pertaining to our study was written in the eleventh century.

The significance of the Cūḷavaṁsa with respect to our study lies in the fact that it generally appears to give a reliable account of the period; it records events of the past and most of its contents are corroborated by contemporary inscriptions and other sources. Therefore, in a study of kingship in Ceylon, the data that are available in the Cūḷavaṁsa, although of a limited nature, are invaluable.

As to the authenticity of the account in the relevant section of the Cūḷavaṁsa, the chapters dealing with the history of our period, from Sirimeghavaṇṇa to Mahinda V, appear to inspire great confidence as most of the events mentioned there are readily confirmed by contemporary inscriptions. One example may be sufficient to elucidate this point. In referring to the reign of Kassapa V (914-923) the Cūḷavaṁsa says that this king was the son of Saṁghā,[1] who was the twice-anointed queen, spouse of

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, v. 9.

Sena II;[1] that Kassapa was given the title of uparāja soon after his birth;[2] that when king, he built a hospital;[3] that he built the Silāmeghapabbata vihāra and enforced the rules of discipline among the Saṅgha;[4] that he had the Maricavaṭṭi vihāra rebuilt;[5] that he expounded the Abhidhamma and had it written on plates of gold.[6] It is remarkable that every minor detail in the above account is confirmed by the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V.[7]

There are also certain limitations in the Cūlavaṁsa and with regard to our study the major deficiency

---

1. Cv., chap. 52, v. 37; see Cv., p. 162, note 2 and E.Z., vol. I, p. 50, note 17.

2. Cv., chap. 51, v. 12.

3. Cv., chap. 52, v. 57.

4. Cv., chap. 52, v. 58, v. 44.

5. Cv., chap. 52, v. 45.

6. Cv., chap. 52, vv. 49-50.

7. . . . mapurum Buddas Siri-Saṅg-boy Abahay maharaj hat jā Saṅg-Baṅday apa bisev rājnāṇiyan kushi hevä dunūsänahi me yuva-raj bisev-siri pämäṇä . . . debisevä jā Salameyvan Abahay maharaj-yutār Mirisiviṭi Saṅgsen-aram . . . karay . . . raj-ved-hal karay . . . Bud ruvan ariyay Dham-ruvan kavari-seyekin pujanemi ho yana adahas puray Abhidham-desun kasun pat aravay maha-pujä koṭ sasun siṭavami yana sit doḷnen ätjara-paya hamuyehi eme dham desun viyakhan kaḷa . . . tuman sat läṅgu savana havurudu yehi Salameyvan-pavu karay . . . me me nakay abadi avasaṭ me sirit täbävūhu . . . (E.Z., vol. I, pp. 46-47, lines 3-12).

'The great king Salameyvan Abahay was conceived in

is that it concentrates mainly on the religious activities of the kings; its information concerning other aspects of kingship is rather meagre. Moreover, the authors of the Cūḷavaṁsa may often have seen the past in the light of their own days, so that the possibility of anachronisms and mistranslations of the terms is not excluded here and there. The rendering of the term āpā into ādipāda can be cited as an example.[1]

Although the compilation of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa and the Sīhaḷavatthuppakaraṇa has been assigned to the period between the eighth and tenth centuries, the former is mainly a commentary to the Mahāvaṁsa and most of the events recorded in the latter two works fall within the early Anurādhapura period. Therefore the utility of these works concerning the period

---

the womb of our anointed queen Saňg-Baňḍay, being born unto His Majesty Buddas Siri Saňgboy Abahay Maharaj . . . (His Majesty) born of the twice-anointed queen, received at the very instant of his birth the auspicious unction of yuva-rāja . . . He rebuilt the Mirisiviṭi, the Saňgsen aram . . . By establishing royal medical halls near the Southern Gate . . . he allayed the fear of disease . . . In fulfilment of the resolution (appearing in his words) 'how shall I honour the Dhamma gem', he caused the Abhidhamma discourses to be transcribed on plates of gold and therewith made a great offering. Yearning in his heart to establish the Buddhist religion, he preached that same dhamma in the presence of his esteemed teacher . . . Our sovereign Lord . . . built in the sixth year . . . the monastery Salameyvan pavu. . . and enacted these regulations for the monasteries connected with this fraternity. . . (E.Z., vol. I, pp. 51-5

1. See pp. 99-102.

under survey is rather limited.

Among other Pāli chronicles, the Mahābodhivaṁsa which deals with the history of the Bodhi Tree, the Thūpavaṁsa which relates the history of the stūpas and the Dāṭhāvaṁsa which deals with the history of the Tooth Relic may be mentioned.[1] Though the object of these works was to set forth the history of a particular Relic or sacred object, they also give the history of the Island up to the events they purport to describe.

Another category of Pāli sources are the commentaries written by Buddhaghosa and other scholars. These works contain many incidental references of value regarding the religious, social and political history of the Island. Much of this material has already been collected by Adikaram and Buddhadatta mahāthera.[2] The composition of the Pāli commentaries fall within the period under consideration, but their value as sources of information for our period is rather restricted. The purpose of Buddhaghosa as well as other commentators 'was not to write a series of

---

1. For details see U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 54-55.

2. E. W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp. 1-33; see also Tilak Hettiarachchy, 'History of Kingship in Ceylon up to the fourth century A.D.' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970), p. 5.

original books on Buddhism but to put into Pāli in a coherent and intelligent form the matter already existing in the various Sinhalese commentaries'.[1] The compilation of these Sinhalese commentaries has been assigned to the period between the third and the first century B.C.[2] Thus it is clear that the contents of the Pāli commentaries do not have a direct bearing on the period in which they were composed. But, it is not unlikely that the compilers of these works were influenced by the ideas of their own times and that they made use of illustrations drawn from contemporary life and history. However, a certain amount of caution is needed in utilizing their material for the period under consideration.

Among the many Sinhalese literary works of a later period, which contain historical data relevant to our study, the Pūjāvaliya, the Siṁhala Thūpavaṁsa, the Daḷadāsirita, the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, the Rājaratnākaraya and the Rājāvaliya figure foremost. The importance of these works as sources of history as well as the age of

---

1. E. W. Adikaram, op. cit., p. 2.

2. G. P. Malalasekera, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 45; see pp. 145-146 below.

compilation and authorships have been discussed in greater detail by several scholars.[1] The significance of these works is that they contain a few popular traditions and additional information not given in the Cūlavaṁsa.

In addition to these sources, Lak Raja Lō Sirita, a manuscript written in 1769 A.D., provides valuable information on the institution of kingship in Ceylon. This is a catechism on the traditional laws and customs of the country and its rulers. Although this work has been composed at a later date, it refers not only to the conditions of its day but also to the traditions and laws existing in the country from ancient times. This manuscript is in fact the only work so far discovered of this nature and is consulted in detail for the first time in the present study.

It is noteworthy that neither the Cūlavaṁsa nor any of the other Ceylonese chronicles was written as a historical treatise in the modern sense. The emphasis was laid mainly on the religious matters and the meritorious

---

1. C. E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature (1955), pp. 107-110, 111-115, 122-124, 127-129, 222-224; S. Wickremasinghe, 'The Age of Parākramabāhu I' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958), pp. 33-69; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 53-58; A. Liyanagamage, The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Daṁbadeniya (1968), pp. 11-27.

deeds of the kings; interwoven with these are the important political developments of each reign. As historical works they may reveal many deficiences but that should not deter us from using their material. However, being religiously biased these works do not provide us with a balanced picture of all aspects of history. This deficiency is greatly felt in a study of kingship in Ceylon. Moreover, we do not possess for ancient or medieval Ceylon any theoretical texts on political philosophy. Therefore, the data that can be obtained from the Cūḷavaṁsa and other literary sources will have to be supplemented by the notions of kingship referred to in later political and literary works and also by comparison with parallel institutions in India.

Epigraphic records constitute the other main source of information for our study. Generally, epigraphic records are considered more reliable because of their close proximity to the events they deal with and the documentary nature of their contents.

The period under review is rich in inscriptions but they are not evenly distributed over the period. Inscriptions become rare from the time of Dhātusena (latter half of the fifth century); those that are found are rarely

datable and mostly deal with the manumission of slaves who served in monasteries. They become abundant from the time of Sena I (middle of the ninth century). Inscriptions of this period are mostly written on pillars, occasionally on stone slabs, but rarely on natural rock. They are mostly concerned with the grant of immunities to villages owned by the great monasteires and sometimes by public institutions . A remarkable feature of these records is that they all appear to have been written in the same style.[1] In fact in the ninth and tenth centuries, a formula in which such documents were worded seems to have been in use. There are many variations in detail, but, in the main, all these grants of immunities were drawn up according to a stereotyped model. They open with the date in the regnal year of the reigning monarch and, after giving the names of the land and the institution or person concerned, mention the order delivered, with the consent of the Council, by the king or the heir-apparent, granting the immunities specified. This is followed by the names of the officials who were deputed to proclaim the edict in the village concerned and the details of the immunities,

---

1. See for example, E.Z., vol. I, nos. 11-13; 16 and 17; vol. II, nos. 1-12.

such as the dues from which the land was exempted, or the officials whose entry to the land in question was forbidden. Sometimes, the names of the officials who proclaimed the edict follow the details regarding the immunities.

Although there are difficulties in clarifying certain terms used in these records, they are of great importance because they are the only official documents which are strictly contemporary with the conditions mentioned in them. They give important information on the king's rights on land, on immunities and other privileges enjoyed by the donees, on designations of royal officers, on system of taxation and the power of local government etc. These inscriptions also shed some valuable light on the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha of this period.

In the course of the tenth century, and especially towards the end of it, there are a few very long inscriptions which record the promulgation of regulations by the king for various purposes. Several of these inscriptions contain detailed rules and regulations pertaining to the administration of monasteries and monastic property. The Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV, the Anurādhapura

Slab Inscription of Kassapa V, the Kaludiyapokuṇa Inscription of Sena III and the Puliyankuḷam Slab Inscription of Udā Mahayā fall within this category.[1] These records not only provide valuable data concerning monastic administration but they are also useful for the understanding of the relationship between the Saṅgha and the royalty of this period. Among other inscriptions the Badulla Pillar Inscription which contains rules enacted by Udaya IV in connexion with the management of a market town is noteworthy.

Another significant feature of the inscriptions of this period is the addition of a panegyrical introduction or a praśasti at the beginning of the record.[2] Up to the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914) the inscriptions have but a bare introduction. But by the tenth century it became almost an invariable practice to include praśastis in all important records of kings. The praśastis in their fullest contain many types of data. These

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 75-113; E.Z., vol. I, pp. 42-56; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 253-269; E.Z., vol. I, pp. 182-190.

2. Lakshman S. Perera, 'The Royal Lineage in the Praśastis of the 8th - 10th century Inscriptions', The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. II, nos. 3 and 4 (1953), pp. 230-231.

include the royal lineage and descent, royal titles and special achievements of kings. But one has to be rather circumspect in utilizing the meterial of the Praśastis for history for they contain fictitious as well as factual details.

On the whole, the inscriptions provide many valuable data for our study, but one main disadvantage is that a large number of inscriptions still await publication. Moreover, the edition and interpretation of many of the published records require a considerable amount of revision. The difficulty in assigning some inscriptions definitely to a particular king and the obscurity of the meaning of some of the words used in these records can be cited as two other disadvantages. In spite of these shortcomings, the inscriptions as well as literary sources provide many basic data for the present study.

CHAPTER II

ROYAL TITLES AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

Epigraphs contain most valuable data concerning the titles used by the kings of this period. The Cūḷavaṁsa which is considered to be the basic source in almost any study of the history of early medieval Ceylon does not provide us with sufficient data in this particular aspect of kingship.

The compilers of the Cūḷavaṁsa have used numerous designations to denote kings in their work such as narissara[1] 'lord of men', mahāyasa[2] 'illustrious one', narāsabha[3] 'bull among men', mahīpati[4] 'lord of the earth', bhūpati[5] 'lord of the earth', mahāmati[6] 'the discerning

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, v. 56.
2. Cv., chap. 37, v. 77.
3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 81.
4. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 95, 105, 122, 145, 152; chap. 41, v. 91.
5. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 51, 109, 179, 210; chap. 38, vv. 5, 109.
6. Cv., chap. 37, v. 111.

one', bhūmipa[1] 'protector of the earth', bhūpāla[2] 'protector of the earth', narādhipa[3] 'chief of men', narapāla[4] 'protector of men', naruttama[5] 'noblest of men', mahīpāla[6] 'protector of the earth', mahāteja[7] 'illustrious one', narinda[8] 'lord of men', rathesabha[9] 'chariot-bull', bhūminda[10] 'lord of the earth', dharaṇīpati[11] 'lord of the earth', dharaṇīpāla[12] 'ruler of the earth', Laṅkinda[13] 'lord of Laṅkā' and Laṅkissara[14] 'lord of Laṅkā'. But

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, v. 170.
2. Cv., chap. 38, v. 95.
3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 198.
4. Cv., chap. 38, v. 7.
5. Cv., chap. 38, v. 51.
6. Cv., chap. 38, v. 33; chap. 41, v. 92.
7. Cv., chap. 48, v. 133.
8. Cv., chap. 49, v. 37.
9. Cv., chap. 49, v. 38.
10. Cv., chap. 50, v. 65.
11. Cv., chap. 37, v. 248; chap. 38, v. 76; chap. 51, v. 99.
12. Cv., chap. 51, v. 97.
13. Cv., chap. 52, v. 49.
14. Cv., chap. 52, v. 71.

a comparison of these terms given in the Chronicle, which was compiled in a later date, with those of the royal titles appearing in the contemporary inscriptions makes it clear that the terms used in the Chronicle were not the usual titles adopted by the kings of this period.

However, it is likely that the epithets used in the Chronicle represent the notions pertaining to kingship at the time. For instance, many of the epithets referred to above signify the main duty expected of a king, i.e., protection of his people. Some others convey the idea that the king was the sole owner of the earth. The terms bhūpati, bhūpāla, mahīpāla, mahīpati, dharaṇīpati and dharaṇīpāla all of which may be rendered literally as 'ruler of the earth' or 'lord of the earth' can be cited as examples. In fact some of the scholars basing themselves on epithets such as bhūpati, bhūpala and vathimi[1] have interpreted the concept of king as the sole owner of the land. But one has to be rather circumspect in arriving at conclusions on the basis of these epithets

---

1. H. W. Codrington, Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, Colombo, 1938, pp. 5-6; M. B. Ariyapala, Society in Medieval Ceylon, 1956, p. 140; T. B. H. Abeysinghe, Portuguese Rule in Ceylon, Colombo, 1966, p. 101.

because the use of these terms in the chronicles appear to have been determined more by exigencies of metre than by any other consideration. Therefore, it may not be quite appropriate to take these expressions in their literal meaning as they seem to have been used merely as synonyms of raja. Moreover, it should be noted that none of the epithets referred to above are met with in the contemporary records as royal titles. On the other hand, the Cūlavaṁsa, except for a few instances, does not give mention of the titles given to the rulers in their inscriptions. The titles of mapurumuka and Abhaya so frequent in the inscriptions of this period do not occur at all in the Cūlavaṁsa.

The titles used in the epigraphic records are more informative. It appears from these records that most of the titles used by the rulers of the early centuries were in vogue during our period, too. Thus apart from the titles gamaṇi (P. gāmaṇi) and devanapiya (P. devānampiya) used by the kings of the first dynasty at Anurādhapura, the titles of raja, maharaja, mapurumuka, Abhaya and Sirimeghavaṇṇa[1] continued to be in use throughout

---

1. This is of a different nature. See p. 65 below.

this period.

The titles of gamaṇi and devanapiya went out of vogue towards the end of the dynasty which used it. Although it is evident from the inscriptions that the title of gamaṇi was taken by most of the kings[1] before Vasabha, only one king seems to have used it after the first century A.D.[2] As pointed out by Hettiarachchy, with the growth of power and prestige, the kings might have discarded their old title which was indicative of their humble origin.[3] Similarly, the title of devanapiya, another favourite title of the first dynasty, seems to have fallen into desuetude even before that dynasty became effete.[4] This title is not met with in the inscriptions

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 148; E.Z., vol. V, pp. 210, 217, 220, 232; J.R.A.S.C.B., n.s., II, pp. 136-137; A.S.C.A.R., (1933), J. 14; U.C.R., VII, p. 247; Muller, A.I.C., pp. 439-440; S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, p. I, no. 4; p. 3, no. 29, no. 31, no. 34; p. 4, no. 46, no. 47; p. 5, no. 56; p. 16, no. 193; p. 17, no. 211; p. 19, no. 236; p. 31, no. 404; p. 33, nos. 422-428.

2. The last ruler who used this title was Gajabāhu I, who is referred to in inscriptions as Gayabahuka gamaṇi abhaya or gamaṇi abaya alone (Muller, A.I.C., p. 109 and E.Z., vol. III, p. 115).

3. For details see T. Hettiarachchy, History of Kingship in Ceylon (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970), pp. 10-28; p. 93.

4. For a discussion of this title, see Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 72-77.

after the reign of Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga (7-19 A.D.). The only exception is a record from a place called Kandakādu in the Anurādhapura District in which occurs the title of denupe, a variant of devanapiya, prefixed to the name of Upatissa II (517-518).[1] Thus it would appear that an attempt was taken to revive this title after a long period during which it had fallen into desuetude. But it is not possible to draw a conclusion on the strength of this isolated occurrence because one cannot be certain of the reading of the inscription as it is not well-preserved.

Raja indicates rulership[2] and is used as the general designation of a king, supreme or provincial.[3] According to the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, there were five categories of persons to whom the title raja can be applied, namely, supreme ruler of the Island (dīpādhirāja), ruler of a district (maṇḍalikarāja), ruler of a province (pradeśarāja), feudatory nobles (antarabhogikarāja) and counsellors (anuśāsikarāja).[4] Therefore, generally speaking

---

1. E.Z., vol. V, p. 77.

2. For the definition of the term raja see pp. 196-198 below

3. Sanskrit - English Dictionary, Monier Williams; Pali - English Dictionary, ed. T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede.

4. Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, trans. C. M. Fernando, p. 27; see also E.Z., vol. IV, p. 108, n. 1.

the term raja can be applied to any ruler who claims authority over a group of people whatever the territorial extent of his rule be.[1]

It appears from the inscriptions that most of the kings who flourished in the early Anurādhapura period used the title of raja.[2] But, during the period under survey only a few rulers seem to have taken this title which had been used so frequently by their predecessors. These few monarchs could be named as Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328),[3] Kumāradhātusena (508-516),[4] Sena I (833-853),[5] Sena II (853-887)[6] and Dappula IV (V) (924-935).[7] In

---

1. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., p. 13.

2. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, II, pp. 136-137; C.A.L.R., III, p. 205 (no. 2); C.J.Sc., Section G, II, p. 150, n. 1, p. 179, p. 218; A.I.C., p. 73, no. 4, p. 74, no. 1

3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 224.

4. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 123.

5. E.Z., vol. III, p. 290.

6. E.Z., vol. V, p. 387.

7. Ibid.

general, the kings of our period were styled maharaja in a majority of their inscriptions, but it is noteworthy that there was no apparent distinction between maharaja and raja. Dappula IV who is styled raja in the Aturupolayagama Inscription is referred to by the title of maharaja in a number of other inscriptions.[1] Similarly, Sirimeghavaṇṇa is given the title maharaja in the Tōnigala Rock Inscription.[2] Sena II to whom the title raja is given in the Aturupolayagama Inscription is called maharaja in no less than four records found at different places.[3] Therefore, as in the early period,[4] the two terms maharaja and raja were understood and used as synonyms, no great emphasis being laid on the former. However, the kings of our period seem to have preferred the elaborate title maharaja, with the prefix maha indicating 'great', to the more general term raja.

A point of interest to be noted here is that during the period under survey the title of raja and

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 187; E.Z., vol. II, p. 47; E.Z., vol. III, p. 127, p. 219; E.Z., vol. V, p. 376.
2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 177.
3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46; E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 41.
4. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

maharaja do not appear to have been used in connexion with the rulers who failed to undergo the ceremony of consecration. For instance, Mahinda I (730-733) who is said to have carried the duties of a king without undergoing the ceremony of abhiṣeka[1] is not given the titles of raja or maharaja in any of his inscriptions or in the Cūḷavaṁsa.[2] Similarly, Mahinda II (777-797) who became king after the death of Aggabodhi VII is not referred to by the royal title in the Cūḷavaṁsa until he had his abhiṣeka performed.[3] In the rock inscription near Dakkhiṇathūpa at Anurādhapura, the less pretentious title of parumaka is used to denote Dāṭhopatissa I (639-650).[4] But the fact that a document is dated in his era is evidence that Dāṭhopatissa's sovereignty was acknowledged. However, the inscription does not refer to Dāṭhopatissa as raja or maharaja or mapurumuka, as is usual in inscriptions when they name the reigning monarch. According to

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 26-28.
2. See p. 179 below.
3. For details see pp. 180-181 below.
4. Daḷapatisa parumaka (E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 65).

the Cūḷavaṁsa, he, too, appears to have failed to undergo the ceremony of consecration.[1] When Dāṭhopatissa I fought with Aggabodhi III for the sovereignty, the latter fled to South India, taking with him an important item of the regalia of those days - a pearl necklace called ekāvalī -,[2] without which custom apparently forbade a king to be consecrated. This was probably the reason why the record in question styled him 'lord' instead of king or great king.

Another term which is used side by side with maharaja to denote the rulers of our period is mapurumuka (var. mapurumu, mapuruma, mapurmukā, mapurum, mapurumukā). The title of mapurumuka came into vogue in the second century A.D.[3] and continued to be in use till the tenth century. This term has not so far been found in an inscription anterior to the second century A.D., and a corresponding Pāli term does not occur at all in the chronicles.

The first king to bear this title is Kaniṭṭha Tissa (167-186), a scion of the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty. In

---

1. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 127-128.

2. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 127-128.

3. See A.S.C., Seventh Progress Report, p. 47.

the Tammännākanda Inscription he is styled mapurumaka Maḷitisa maharaja.[1] But, it is noteworthy that out of the fourteen inscriptions which have been assigned to the reign of Kaniṭṭha Tissa, this is the only record in which this title is used. After Kaniṭṭha Tissa, the title is not met with in the inscriptions until the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328). In the Kārambagala Inscription of Sirimeghavaṇṇa, his father Mahāsena is given the title of maparumaka.[2] But the absence of this title in the inscriptions from Kaniṭṭha Tissa to Sirimeghavaṇṇa - period of a little over a century - does not necessarily imply that the title was not in use during that period for the number of inscriptions discovered after Kaniṭṭha Tissa is relatively very few. The title of mapurumuka became frequent in the period under survey. Apart from maharaja, this is the most extensively used term to denote the kings of our period.

It has been pointed out that the title mapurumuka

---

1. A.S.C., Seventh Progress Report, p. 47.

2. Maparumaka Mahasena maharaja (E.Z., vol. III, p. 179, n. 3; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 224); see also the Bovattagala Inscription, Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, p. 68; A.S.C.A.R., 1934, para. 71 (VIII).

is a corruption of mahaparumaka (Skt. mahā-pramukha, Pāli mahā-pamukha or mahā-pāmokkha).[1] Though mapurumuka itself does not occur in the earliest inscriptions, the epithet parumaka is found very frequently in them, but not as a royal title. The difference in meaning between these two titles is one of degree only, the royal title having maha 'great' prefixed to the less pretentious one. It is remarkable that when the royal title mapurumaka first occurs in the inscriptions, the title parumaka is no longer found in them. The last occurrence of parumaka in an epigraph was early in the first century A.D.[2] It is also noteworthy that a new dynasty came into existence during this period. The first dynasty of Sinhalese kings became effete by about the middle of the first century and a new dynasty called Lambakaṇṇa was founded by Vasabha in 65 A.D.[3] Thus it is clear that the disappearance of the title parumaka and the rise of the Lambakaṇṇas into power

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S., 1936, p. 447.

2. C. W. Nicholas, 'The titles of the Sinhalese kings as recorded in the inscriptions of third century B.C. to third century A.C.', U.C.R., vol. VII, no. IV (1949), p. 246.

3. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 177-180.

were contemporaneous. Another point to be noted here is the introduction of the title mapurumuka by the members of this new dynasty. The first ruler to assume this epithet was Kaṇiṭṭha Tissa, a scion of the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty.[1]

From this analysis it becomes clear that the disappearance of the title parumaka, the emergence of the Lambakaṇṇas into power and the introduction of the term mapurumuka as a royal title are closely connected with one another. Therefore, it is necessary to find out the origin of the title parumaka and the Lambakaṇṇas in order to analyse what exactly is the significance of the term mapurumuka.

The word parumaka is taken as the Sinhalese equivalent of the Sanskrit pramukha and the Pāli pamukha or pāmokkha[2] which is often used to denote the president of a guild or corporation.[3] It was also used to refer to the nobles who formed the aristocratic republics which

---

1. A.S.C., Seventh Progress Report, p. 47, no. 3.
2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 123; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 235.
3. Radhakumud Mukerjee, Local Government in Ancient India, p. 47.

existed in North India in the time of the Buddha.[1] Paranavitana is of opinion that the persons called parumakas in ancient Ceylon were of the same status as the pāmokkhas among the Cetas and other republican tribes of ancient India.[2]

The early inscriptions of Ceylon contain numerous references to persons bearing the title of parumaka.[3] Many of the parumakas figuring in these inscriptions appear to have held high offices of state. The senāpatis of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi and Saddhātissa were parumakas.[4] Parumakas who held the office of treasurer (baḍakarika) are mentioned in a number of inscriptions.[5] Similarly, we find mention of

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S., 1936, p. 448.

2. Ibid.

3. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 1, no. 7; p. 13, no. 166; p. 15, no. 182; p. 34, no. 435; p. 49, no. 654; p. 61, no. 804; p. 73, no. 939; p. 90, no. 1140.

4. Ibid., p. 47, no. 620; p. 55, no. 724; A.S.C.A.R., 1940-1945, p. 149.

5. Ibid., p. 1, no. 3; p. 2, no. 22, p. 5, no. 63; p. 23, no. 296; p. 47, no. 621.

many other parumakas who held the offices of ministers,[1] superintendents (adeka),[2] record-keepers,[3] revenue officers[4] and so forth.[5] Thus it appears, as pointed out by Hettiarachchy, that the ruling class which filled most of the administrative ranks of the day was known as parumakas. There is but least doubt that the Lambakaṇṇas also fall into the order of parumakas.

It cannot be said with certainty how the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty originated in Ceylon, but it appears that they came into prominence by holding high administrative posts of the State. The Sinhalese form of the name, Lämäṇi, has been used as the equivalent of Pāli Lekhaka

---

1. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 13, no. 161.

2. Ibid., p. 28, no. 355; p. 69, no. 894, no. 896a.

3. Ibid., p. 97, no. 1202. See also E.Z., vol. V, pp. 410-412.

4. Ibid., p. 48, no. 647.

5. For details see, C. W. Nicholas, 'Some offices and titles in the early Sinhalese kingdom', U.C.R., vol. VIII, 1950, pp. 121-124; T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 106-116; S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, pp. lxxii - lxxxvi.

meaning 'scribe'.[1] Later sources[2] trace the descent of the Lambakaṇṇas to Sumitta, who was one of the eight princes that accompanied the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon. According to the Mahābodhivaṁsa[3] and the Pūjāvaliya,[4] Sumitta was given the post of chief scribe or the record-keeper of the Bodhi Tree (Jayamahālekhaka). The Lambakaṇṇas who captured the throne in the reign of Iḷanāga[5] are called amaccas in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī.[6] During the reign of Sabha, a Lambakaṇṇa functioned as the commander-in-chief.[7] It is evident from these references that at the time when the Lambakaṇṇas first appeared in History, they held high positions

---

1. See for instance, Nikāya Saṅgrahaya (text p. 14) where Lämäṇi (Lambakaṇṇa) duvak stands for lekhaka-dhīṭikā in the Mahāvaṁsa (chap. XXXVII, v. 26).

2. Saddharmaratnākaraya, Colombo, 1923, p. 296; Kāvya-śekharaya, ed. R. Dharmarama, pp. 229-231.

3. Mahābodhivaṁsa, p. 154.

4. Pūjāvaliya, p. 721.

5. Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 16-19.

6. Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, pt. II, p. 644.

7. Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 59-60.

in the administration.

The earliest reference to Lambakaṇṇas occurs in the Mahāvaṁsa in the reign of Iḷanāga (33-43).[1] It is said that when Iḷanāga went for a royal bath in the Tisāvāpi with the Lambakaṇṇas, they deserted him and came back to the capital. The king punished the Lambakaṇṇas by making them perform manual labour on a road that was being constructed to the Mahāthūpa. He further appointed Caṇḍālas - men of a low social standing - to supervise their work.[2] The punishment meted out to them by the king Iḷanāga implies that the Lambakaṇṇas enjoyed a great social recognition. The king tried to humiliate them by ordering them to work under the supervision of the Caṇḍālas (low-castes). The Lambakaṇṇas did not take this humuliation lying down. They rebelled against the king, took him in captivity and held sway for three years.[3] There was no hostility whatsoever against these usurpers during their three years of reign. It was only after a great struggle that Iḷanāga managed to regain his power. Thus, it appears that the Lambakaṇṇas not only enjoyed high social status

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 16-40.
2. Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 16-18.
3. Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 18-19.

but also acted as a powerful group in the society before they came into power. Their position was further strengthened by holding high offices of the State.

As pointed out above, the aristocratic class which filled most of the administrative ranks of the day was called parumakas. In other words, parumaka was a special title bestowed on the nobility of the day.[1] As a group who enjoyed great social recognition and held high offices of the state, the Lambakaṇṇas may also have belonged to the order of parumakas. Therefore, when the Lambakaṇṇas gained power in the first century A.D., they may have continued to use the title parumaka with the prefix 'maha' as a generic term or merely as a legacy of the past. With the introduction of mapurumuka (maha - parumaka) as a royal epithet, the old title of the nobility - parumaka - ceased to exist; apparently it now became exclusively royal with maha 'great' prefixed to it. Literally, the word mapurumuka (maha - parumaka) means 'great chief', and thus it is clear that it did not enhance the position

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 17; C. W. Nicholas, 'Some offices and titles in the early Sinhalese kingdom', U.C.R., vol. VIII, 1950, p. 124; H. Ellawala, Social History of Early Ceylon, pp. 37-38.

of the king. Therefore, if the Lambakaṇṇas did not belong to the order of parumakas, it is rather strange for them to introduce such a less pretentious title especially at a time when the kings represented as paramount lords of the Island.

Most rulers of the period under survey are referred to by the title mapurumuka in their inscriptions. Thus Kassapa I (473-491),[1] Kumāradhātusena (508-516),[2] Moggallāna II (531-551),[3] Kittisirimegha (551-569),[4] Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667),[5] Kassapa III (724-730),[6] Sena I (833-853),[7] Sena II (853-887),[8] Udaya II (887-898),[9] Kassapa IV (898-

---

1. U.C.R., vol. XIX, no. 2 (1961), p. 98.
2. Ibid., p. 101.
3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 294.
4. E.Z., vol. V, p. 85.
5. U.C.R., vol. XIX, no. 2 (1961), p. 104 (tentatively attributed).
6. E.Z., vol. III, p. 198.
7. Ibid., p. 293.
8. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46; E.Z., vol. II, p. 17; E.Z., vol. III, p. 258; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 179; E.Z., vol. V, p. 263, p. 285.
9. E.Z., vol. I, p. 168, p. 174; E.Z., vol. II, p. 4, p. 7; E.Z., vol. V, p. 383.

914),[1] Kassapa V (914-923),[2] Dappula IV (924-935),[3] Sena III (938-946)[4] and Mahinda IV (956-972)[5] are styled mapurumuka in their records.

A point of interest to be noted here is that although the title mapurumuka conveyed the meaning 'great chief', it did not signify any lesser degree of authority than by the term maharaja. This is evidenced by the indiscriminate use of the title mapurumuka and maharaja by the kings of our period. Sena II who is styled mapurmuka in no less than seven records[6] is called maharaja in a number of other inscriptions.[7] The title of mapurumuka is used in referring to Udaya II in the pillar

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 159, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 12, p. 23; E.Z., vol. III, p. 103, p. 273; E.Z., vol. V, p. 351, p. 361.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 196; E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 36, p. 41; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 34; E.Z., vol. V, p. 294.

3. Dappula V in earlier lists. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24; E.Z., vol. V, p. 305.

4. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 189 (tentatively attributed).

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 38.

6. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46; E.Z., vol. II, p. 17; E.Z., vol. III, p. 258; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 179; E.Z., vol. V, p. 263, p. 285.

7. E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 41, p. 47.

inscriptions of Kirigallāva,[1] Noccipotāna,[2] Ellevewa,[3] Iripinniyāva[4] and Rambāva.[5] At least in four other records he is given the title maharaja.[6] Similarly, Kassapa IV (898-914),[7] Kassapa V (914-923),[8] Dappula IV (924-935),[9] Sena III (938-946)[10] and Mahinda IV (956-972)[11] are referred to by the titles mapurumuka and maharaja indiscriminately in their records. Another point to be noted

---

1. E.Z., vol. II, p. 4.

2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 7.

3. E.Z., vol. V, p. 383.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 168 (tentatively attributed).

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 174. For correct identification of the king, see E.Z., vol. II, pp. 9-10.

6. E.Z., vol. I, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 12; E.Z., vol. III, p. 139; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 183.

7. E.Z., vol. I, p. 159, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 12, p. 23; E.Z., vol. III, p. 103, p. 273; E.Z., vol. V, p. 351, p. 361. Cf. E.Z., vol. II, p. 233; E.Z., vol. III, p. 299.

8. E.Z., vol. I, p. 196; E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 36, p. 41; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 34; E.Z., vol. V, p. 294. Cf. E.Z., vol. I, p. 46.

9. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24; E.Z., vol. V, p. 305. Cf. E.Z., vol. I, p. 187; E.Z., vol. II, p. 47; E.Z., vol. III, p. 127, p. 219; E.Z., vol. V, p. 376.

10. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 189. Cf. E.Z., vol. III, p. 297.

11. E.Z., vol. I, p. 38. Cf. E.Z., vol. I, p. 33, p. 91, p. 117, p. 223, p. 235, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 67; E.Z., vol. III, p. 227; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 62.

here is that both mapurumuka and maharaja are used in the same record to refer to the same ruler. In the Nilagama Rock Inscription, Moggallana II (531-551) is styled mapurumu maharaji.[1] In the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription, Kassapa V (914-923) gives both titles - mapurumu and maharaja - to his father Sena II, while he himself takes maharaja as his title.[2] Similarly, Dappula IV (924-935) assumes mapurumu as well as maharaja in his Vessagiri Slab Inscription.[3]

From the evidence given above, it becomes clear that there was no apparent distinction between maharaja and mapurumuka and that the latter was used as a general designation of royal authority. In fact, in many of the inscriptions of this period, the title mapurumuka appears to have been used in place of raja or maharaja.[4]

Some of the kings of our period bore the title of Budadasa (P. Buddhadāsa). The title occurs in the

---

1. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 294.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 46.

3. Ibid., p. 24.

4. U.C.R., vol. XIX, no. 2 (1961), p. 101, p. 104; E.Z., vol. I, p. 159, p. 168, p. 174, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 4, p. 7, p. 12, p. 17; E.Z., vol. III, p. 198, p. 258, p. 293; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 179; E.Z., vol. V, p. 85, p. 263, p. 285, p. 383.

Cūḷavaṁsa as the personal name of a king who ruled in the fourth century A.D.[1] But it is not unlikely that even in the case of this king, Buddhadāsa was only an epithet although the Cūḷavaṁsa gives it as his proper name. This view gains some measure of support by the fact that the king who is called Buddhadāsa in the Cūḷavaṁsa is referred to by the name Mahāsena in his inscriptions. In the inscription discovered at the Jetavanārāma area in Anurādhapura, he is referred to by the name Mahāsena alone.[2] The Ruvanvälisäya Pillar Inscription refers to him as Budadasa Mahasena maharaja[3] - apparently Budadasa stands here as an epithet. Therefore, it can be concluded that in the Cūḷavaṁsa the title of the king is given as his proper name.[4]

The title Budadasa (P. Buddhadāsa) undoubtedly denoted religious significance. Literally it means

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, v. 105.

2. A.S.C., Annual Report, 1911-1912, p. 73, no. 16; see also E.Z., vol. III, p. 121, n. 4.

3. E.Z., vol. III, p. 122.

4. Similarly, in the Mahāvaṁsa, gāmaṇi is given as a part of the personal name of some of the kings belonging to the pre-Christian and early Christian centuries. But from a study of the early inscriptions, it becomes evident that gāmaṇi was not a personal name, but a title.

'servant of the Buddha' and as pointed out by Paranavitana, the kings of our period may have used it to express their devotion to the Buddhist faith.[1] Among the kings who bore the title of Budadasa, Moggallāna II (531-551),[2] Kittisirimegha (551-569),[3] Sena II (853-887)[4] and Dappula IV (924-935)[5] may be mentioned.

The epithets used to denote Mahānāma (406-428) in contemporary records and in literary works are of particular interest. In an inscription at Monarāgala and in another from Tissamahārāma, now in the Colombo Museum, Mahānāma is given the epithet Tiripali.[6] The Samantapāsādikā, the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā and the Saddhammapajjotikā, all attributed to the reign of Mahānāma,[7] refer

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 364.
2. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 294.
3. E.Z., vol. V, p. 85.
4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46.
5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24.
6. C.J.Sc., Section G, vol. II, p. 18.
7. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 390-391; G. P. Malalasekara, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 96.

to him by the epithets of Sirinivāsa, Siripāla and Sirikudda.[1]

The epithet Tiripali is equal to Pāli Siripālita which means 'protected by the Goddess of Prosperity'.[2] The same meaning is conveyed by the other two epithets - Sirinivāsa and Sirikudda - which mean 'the abode of the Goddess of Prosperity' and 'the Summit of Prosperity' respectively. Apart from Mahānāma, no other king appears to have used these epithets.

Another commonly used title by the kings of our period is Abaya (var. Aba, Abhā, Apaya, Abahay). The term is also met with in the inscriptions of the early Anurādhapura period and in the Mahāvaṁsa where it is given as a part of the personal name of some of the kings belonging to the early period.[3] Abaya (P. Abhaya) occurs frequently in the Buddhist literature as a proper name.[4]

---

1. Samantapāsādikā, (P.T.S.), ed. J. Takakusu and Makoto Nagai, vol. VI, p. 1415; Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, IV, p. 235; Saddhammapajjotikā, (P.T.S), ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, vol II, p. 152; see also B. C. Law, Buddhaghosa, p. 22.

2. Tiri = (Pāli) Siri 'Goddess of Prosperity'; pali = (Pāli) pālita 'protected' (C.J.Sc., Section G, vol. II, p. 18).

3. Mv., chap. XV, v. 59; chap. XXII, v. 71; chap. XXVI, v. 6; chap. XXXIII, v. 102; chap. XXXIV, v. 37; chap. XXXV, v. 1, v. 12.

4. Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 392 ff; Theragāthā, (P.T.S.), v. 98; Sammohavinodanī, (P.T.S.), p. 275; Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, (P.T.S.), III, p. 786; Buddhavaṁsa, (P.T.S.),

Therefore, it is not unlikely that it first came into vogue in the early Anurādhapura period as a proper name, but later it appears to have been used also as a semi title.[1]

It is evident from the inscriptions that the name Abhaya is used during our period as a title rather than as a part of the personal name of kings. In the inscriptions of the fourth to sixth centuries, the term Abaya always occurs after maharaja or raja thus indicating its position as a title.[2] The only exception is the Tōnigala Rock Inscription where it is inserted between the throne name Sirimekavaṇa and maharaja.[3]

The title of Abaya continued to be in use throughout our period. Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328),[4] Jeṭṭhatissa II

XV. 19; Cv., chap. 67, v. 61; Papañcasūdanī, (P.T.S.), I, 290; Sāratthappakāsinī, (P.T.S.), III, 155; Manorathapūraṇī, (P.T.S.), II, 54.

1. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 28-31.

2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 122; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 114, p. 123, p. 224, p. 294; E.Z., vol. V, p. 85; U.C.R., vol. XIX, no. 2, (1961), p. 98; Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, p. 68.

3. E.Z., vol. III, p. 177.

4. E.Z., vol. III, p. 177; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 224.

(328-337),[1] Sena I (833-853),[2] Sena II (853-887),[3] Udaya II (887-898),[4] Kassapa V (914-923),[5] Dappula IV (924-935),[6] Udaya III (935-938),[7] Sena III (938-946)[8] and Mahinda IV (956-972)[9] may be mentioned as a few out of the many rulers who used this title.

Another striking aspect of the use of the title Abaya is that when it was used with the throne name Sirisaṅgabo, it was almost always inserted between the throne

---

1. E.Z., vol. III, p. 122; Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, p. 68.

2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 293.

3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46; E.Z., vol. II, p. 47.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 4, p. 7, p. 12; E.Z., vol. III, p. 139; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 183; E.Z., vol. V, p. 383.

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 46, p. 196; E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 36, p. 41; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 34; E.Z., vol. V, p. 294.

6. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 187; E.Z., vol. II, p. 47; E.Z., vol. III, p. 127; E.Z., vol. V, p. 305, p. 376, p. 387.

7. E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, p. 221, p. 234, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 67.

8. E.Z., vol. III, p. 297; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 189.

9. E.Z., vol. I, p. 33, p. 91, p. 117, p. 223, p. 235, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 67.

name and the title maharaja or mapurumuka.[1] But its position changed when it was used with the throne name Salamevan. It invariably occurs before the name Salamevan (Abhā Salamevan).[2] This may indicate that the term Abaya was also used as an honorific prefix. It occupies about the same position as of siri in Sirisaṅgabo of the ninth and tenth century records.

Paranavitana is of opinion that the term Abaya is derived from Sanskrit Āryapāda.[3] The word Abaya (Skt. Abhaya) literally means 'fearless', 'undaunted', 'secure' etc.[4] Therefore, it is likely that the kings assumed this title as an indication of their bravery.[5]

---

1. Cf. Sirisaṅgabo Abhā maharaj in the Vessagiri Slab Inscription (E.Z., vol. I, p. 33). See also E.Z., vol. I, p. 46, p. 91, p. 117, p. 221, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 67. The only exception is the Aṭavīragollāva Pillar Inscription (E.Z., vol. II, p. 47).

2. Cf. Abhā Salamevan in the Kirigallāva Pillar Inscription (E.Z., vol. II, p. 4). See also E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 91, p. 168, p. 174, p. 187, p. 196, p. 234; E.Z., vol. II, p. 7, p. 12, p. 30, p. 36, p. 41, p. 47, p. 53; E.Z., vol. III, p. 293; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 34, p. 189; E.Z., vol. V, p. 294, p. 305.

3. E.Z., vol. III, p. 124.

4. Sanskrit - English Dictionary, Monier Williams.

5. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 28-31.

Vat-himi or vat-himiyan vahanse are honorific terms often used in referring to the kings of this period.[1] Vat-himi is also found used as a title of respect in speaking of the other members of the royal family such as mahādipādas and ādipādas[2] and sometimes of private individuals, possibly of high rank or aristocratic descent.[3] Another striking point to be noted here is that the same term is used to denote the members, of whatever status, of the Buddhist church.[4]

The word vat-himi has been interpreted as 'Lord of Property or Riches' by taking it to have been derived from Sanskrit vastu + svāmin.[5] As pointed out above, the term is also used in referring to the Buddhist Saṅgha, in which case the above etymology is inappropriate.

Another explanation of the term vat-himi that may be attempted is that vat in vat-himi is an inherited form

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 196; E.Z., vol. II, p. 14; E.Z., vol. III, p. 75, p. 294; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 53, p. 173.

2. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 174 (no. 4), p. 179.

3. E.Z., vol. III, p. 259.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, p. 33, p. 48, p. 187; E.Z., vol. III, p. 265; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 174 (nos. 1 and 2).

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 99, n. 1 and 2.

of Prākrit uvajjhāa, Pāli upajjhāya, Sanskrit upādhyāya.[1] Sinhalese literary works have preserved that use of the word. The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, a work of the tenth century A.D., paraphrases the words upajjhāyavattaṁ as vat teranaṭa kaṭa yutu vat .[2] Commenting on the name Belaṭṭhisīsa, the same work says Anaṅda mahaterun vajateru Belaṭṭhisīsa mahaterun .[3] The Dharmapradīpikā of the twelfth century uses the word vadājuran in the sense of upajjhācariya.[4] The Mahārūpasiddhi-Sannaya of about the fourteenth century paraphrases the word upajjhāyassa as vajādurangē .[5]

It is noteworthy that in old Sinhalese Sanna books, which give word for word meaning, the derived Sinhalese form is used to paraphrase the original Pāli

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, nos. 1 and 2 (1950), p. 167.

2. Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, ed. M. Vimalakitti, p. 111.

3. Ibid., p. 148. Cf. Āyasmato Ānandassa upajjhāyo Belaṭṭhisīso (Pācittiya-Pāli, p. 87).

4. Dharmapradīpikā, p. 293.

5. Mahārūpasiddhi Sannaya, p. 267.

or Sanskrit word wherever possible. Thus vat together with himi (Skt. svāmin), an additional term of respect, may have meant originally a 'religious preceptor', hence a 'lord spiritual' and in course of time it may have been extended to mean also a 'lord temporal'. In this respect, it may be pointed out that the term pirinivi (P. parinibbuta), which from the religious point of view can properly be used only in referring to the passing away of a Buddha or an arahant, was used in the tenth century in reference to the death of a king.[1] Therefore, it is likely that in the same manner, the term vaṭhimi which should, strictly speaking, be used only in reference to a Buddhist monk, was applied also to kings as a mark of great respect.

The second part of the term - vahanse - is used with or without the additional prefix vaṭhimi in referring to the kings of this period.[2] Its etymology is obscure. Müller derives vahan from Pāli upāhana while Wickremasinghe connects it with Sanskrit bhavān.[3] Whatever its

---

1. E.Z., vol. III, p. 77.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 113; E.Z., vol. II, p. 17; E.Z., vol. III, p. 75; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 53, p. 64.

3. J.R.A.S.C.B., 1879, p. 13; E.Z., vol. I, p. 113.

derivation may be, the term vahanse was also used as an honorific to denote the kings as well as the Buddhist Saṅgha.

It appears from the inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries that the epithets Sirisaṅgabo (var. Sirisaṁbo, Sirisagaboyi, Sirisaṅgboy) and Salamevan (var. Salameyvan) were borne alternately by the kings of our period as throne names.[1] When we take the kings of the ninth and tenth centuries in order, Sena I (833-853) had the throne name Salamevan,[2] Sena II (853-887) Sirisaṅgabo,[3] Udaya II (887-898) Salamevan,[4] Kassapa IV (898-914) Sirisaṅgabo,[5] Kassapa V (914-923) Salamevan,[6] Dappula III (IV) (923-924) Sirisaṅgabo,[7] Dappula IV (V)

---

1. E.Z., vol. II, p. 9.

2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 290, p. 293; Cv., chap. 50, v. 43.

3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 46; E.Z., vol. II, p. 17, p. 30, p. 41, p. 47; E.Z., vol. III, p. 258; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 179; E.Z., vol. V, p. 263, p. 285, p. 387.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 168, p. 174 (For correct identification of the king, see E.Z., vol. II, pp. 9-10); E.Z., vol. II, p. 4, p. 7, p. 12; E.Z., vol. III, p. 139; E.Z., vol. V, p. 383.

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 159, p. 204; E.Z., vol. II, p. 12, p. 23, p. 233; E.Z., vol. III, p. 103, p. 273, p. 299; E.Z., vol. V, p. 351, p. 361.

6. E.Z., vol. I, p. 46, p. 196; E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 36, p. 41; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 34, E.Z., vol. V, p. 294.

7. E.Z., vol. III, p. 139.

(924-935) Salamevan,[1] Udaya III (935-938) Sirisaṅgbo and also probably Salamevan,[2] Sena III (938-946) Salamevan,[3] Udaya IV (946-954) Sirisaṅgabo,[4] Sena IV (954-956) probably Salamevan, though we have no definite evidence of the fact, Mahinda IV (956-972) Sirisaṅgabo,[5] Sena V (972-982) Salamevan,[6] and Mahinda V (982-1029) Sirisaṅgabo.[7]

It is clear from the evidence given above that the names Sirisaṅgabo and Salamevan were used alternately by the kings of the ninth and tenth centuries as their

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 24, p. 187; E.Z., vol. II, p. 47; E.Z., vol. V, p. 305, p. 376, p. 387.

2. The only ruler who appears to have used both the titles, see p. 67 below for details. E.Z., vol. I, p. 221, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 67; E.Z., vol. III, p. 139. Cf. also E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, p. 234, E.Z., vol. II, p. 53.

3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 189 (tentatively attributed).

4. E.Z., vol. V, p. 185.

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 33, p. 38, p. 91, p. 117, p. 223, p. 235, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 67; E.Z., vol. III, p. 227.

6. Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, trans. C. M. Fernando, p. 19; Pūjāvaliya, trans. B. Gunasekara, p. 32.

7. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 63.

throne names.[1] A similar custom prevailed among the Coḷa and Pāṇḍya kings in South India. This is evidenced by the use of the epithets Rājakeśarī and Parakeśarī by the Coḷa kings and Māravarman and Jaṭāvarman by the Pāṇḍya rulers.[2]

It is likely that the custom of adopting Sirisaṅgabo and Salamevan as throne names came into vogue before the ninth century A.D. Sirisaṅgabo (P. Sirisaṁghabodhi) first occurs in the Mahāvaṁsa as the personal name of a king who ruled in the third century A.D.[3] In the Cūḷa-vaṁsa it is given as the throne name of Aggabodhi III (628-639) and Aggabodhi IV (667-683) respectively.[4] According to the Pāli literary sources, Mahānāma (406-428)

---

1. So far as we know, there is only one exception to this rule. In the inscriptions of Mahinda IV, his father is styled both as Salamevan and Sirisaṅgabo (E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, p. 221, p. 234, p. 246; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 61, p. 67). Wickremasinghe has identified Mahinda IV's father with Kassapa V (E.Z., vol. II, p. 58 ff.), but Paranavitana has given more plausible reasons to identify him with Udaya III (E.Z., vol. III, p. 219).

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 365.

3. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 73.

4. Cv., chap. 44, v. 83; chap. 46, v. 1.

appears to have borne the throne name Sirisaṁghabodhi.[1] The Timbiriväva Inscription refers to Kumāradhātusena (508-516) as Kumara Sirisagaboyi mapurumukā.[2] This is the first epigraphic reference to the throne name of Sirisaṅgabo. In the Ṭämgoda Inscription, Kittisirimegha (551-569) is given the throne name Sirisaṅgabo.[3] It is clear from the references given above that Sirisaṅgabo was adopted as a throne name by the kings as early as the fifth century A.D.

Saṅgabo (P. Saṁghabodhi) may mean one who has taken refuge in the Saṅgha and the Bodhi. It is mentioned in the Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya that Sirisaṁghabodhi, the successor of Saṁghatissa, was so named because he has taken refuge in the Saṅgha and the Bodhi Tree.[4] Therefore, it appears that the kings adopted the throne name of

---

1. It is said that Saddhammapajjotikā was completed in the twenty-sixth year of a king styled Sirinivāsa Sirisaṁghabodhi (Saddhammapajjotikā, (P.T.S.), vol. II, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, p. 152). This king has been identified with Mahānāma (406-428) (U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 391).

2. U.C.R., vol. XIX, no. 2 (1961), p. 101.

3. E.Z., vol. V, p. 85.

4. Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁsaya, ed. Paññāsara and Vimaladhamma, p. 6.

Sirisaṅgabo as a mark of devotion to the Saṅgha and the Sāsana.

On the other hand, it is likely that the kings assumed this throne name as a consequence of the importance given to the king Sirisaṁghabodhi. Geiger is of opinion that the throne name Sirisaṅgabo was chosen by the later kings 'in honour of this pious king of the Lambakaṇṇa clan'.[1] According to the narrative given in the Mahāvaṁsa, the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṁsa, and the Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, the king Sirisaṁghabodhi appears to have been a pious king who practised the ideal of the Bodhisattva.[2] He is said to have observed the five moral precepts (pañca-sīla) of Buddhism, one of which is abstinence from killing.[3] Thus it is said that he released even the criminals who were condemned to death.[4]

---

1. Cv., p. 82, n. 1; C.C.M.T., p. 117.

2. Mahāvaṁsa, chap. XXXVI, vv. 73-97; Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, chaps. I -VIII; Hatthavanagallavihāravaṁsa, ed. James De Alwis, chaps. I -VIII; see also U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 189-191.

3. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 73.

4. Ibid., vv. 80-81; Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, p. 38.

He is said to have got rid of a pestilence, from which his people suffered, by offering his own flesh to the demon who caused it.[1] When Goṭhābhaya rebelled against him, he left the kingdom and retired to the forest because he did not wish to bring harm to others by going to defend his rights.[2] A detailed account of his 'supreme act of self-sacrifice' is given in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṁsa and the Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya.[3] On hearing the proclamation of Goṭhābhaya,[4] Sirisaṁghabodhi is said to have severed his head from the neck and given it to the peasant, who brought him the tidings, in the hope of attaining Buddhahood in the future.

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 82-89; Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, pp. 27-34.

2. Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 91-92; Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, pp. 38-39; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 190.

3. Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, pp. 40-43; Hatthavanagallavihāravaṁsa, pp. 213-217.

4. When Goṭhābhaya rebelled against him, Sirisaṁghabodhi left the kingdom and retired to the forest to lead the life of an ascetic. But Goṭhābhaya felt his position insecure as long as Sirisaṁghabodhi was alive, and he therefore declared that he would give many favours to anyone who would bring the head of Sirisaṁghabodhi (Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 91-97; Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, pp. 40-43; Pūjāvaliya, trans. B. Gunasekara, p. 23).

Whatever the authenticity of these stories may be, it is clear from the details given above that Sirisaṁghabodhi is represented as a Bodhisattva king.[1] The term mahāsattva, used as an epithet of Bodhisattvas, is applied in the Mahāvaṁsa to Sirisaṁghabodhi.[2] Hence it is likely that the rulers of our period, who considered Sirisaṁghabodhi to be the model of what a Buddhist king ought to be, assumed his name as a throne name. Moreover, it is not surprising that at a time when they entertained the Bodhisattva ideal[3] they would also desire to assume the name of a ruler, who is renowned to have led the life of a Bodhisattva, as a throne name.

Salamevan (P. Silāmeghavaṇṇa) is the other throne name which was used alternately with Sirisaṅgabo. It appears that Salamevan is a variant of the throne name Sirimekavaṇa or Sarimekavaṇa (P. Sirimeghavaṇṇa) occurring in the inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries. In the Cūḷavaṁsa, Sirimeghavaṇṇa as well as Silāmeghavaṇṇa is given as the personal names of two kings who came

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 191.

2. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 90; see also Mv., p. 263, n. 2.

3. See pp. 293-306 below.

to power in the fourth and seventh centuries respectively.[1]

It appears from the Mahāvaṁsa and the epigraphic records that the throne name Sirimeghavaṇṇa first came into use in the third century A.D. The Mahāvaṁsa attributes this name to Goṭhābhaya, the successor of Sirisaṁghabodhi.[2] In the Tiṁbirivāva Rock Inscription, Goṭhābhaya is styled Mekavaṇa Abaya.[3] In the Ruvanvälisäya Pillar Inscription of Buddhadāsa (337-365), his father Jeṭṭhatissa II is called Sirimeka Jeṭatisa.[4] There is no evidence to ascertain whether Sirimekavaṇa was borne by alternate kings as a throne name as early as the third century A.D. However, it is evident from the references given above that the custom of adopting this throne name came into vogue in the third or fourth century A.D.

As pointed out above, the name Sirimekavaṇa seems to have assumed the form of Salamevan in the ninth and tenth century records.[5] It is somewhat difficult to

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, v. 53; chap. 44, v. 65.
2. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 98.
3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 227.
4. E.Z., vol. III, p. 122.
5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 168, p. 174; E.Z., vol. II, p. 4, p. 7, p. 12; E.Z., vol. III, p. 139.

ascertain the significance of the term Salamevan (P. Silā-meghavaṇṇa). The word meghavaṇṇa literally means 'cloud-coloured',[1] i.e., 'the dark one'. Sala appears to be a corruption of the honorific term siri which is generally added to the names and titles of kings. It is rather unlikely, as pointed out by Hettiarachchy, that the kings would assume a throne name merely to indicate the colour of their skin.[2] Therefore, the literal meaning of the term meghavaṇṇa has to be ruled out as an explanation of the term as used by kings.

As referred to above, this name is first met with in the inscriptions as Sarimekavaṇa or mekavaṇa.[3] Hettiarachchy points out that mekavaṇa can be derived from either meghavaṇṇa or meghavaṇa.[4] If this etymology is correct,[5] the throne name in question may imply a religious significance. Meghavana or Mahāmeghavana is the

---

1. Sanskrit - English Dictionary, Monier Williams.
2. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 93-94.
3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 227; E.Z., vol. III, p. 177.
4. T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., p. 94.
5. However, the term occurs in the inscriptions with a cerebral ṇa (mekavaṇa) in which case the above etymology is untenable. For instance, see Timbiriväva Rock Inscription of Goṭhābhaya (E.Z., vol. IV, p. 227).

name of the park donated to the Saṅgha by Devānampiya Tissa.[1] It was in this park the Mahāvihāra, the centre of orthodox Buddhism, was later built.[2] The Mahāvihāra played a significant role in the religious as well as in the political history of the Island.[3] Therefore, it is likely as suggested by Hettiarachchy that the kings assumed the name mekavaṇa or mevan (P. meghavaṇa), the name of the park in which the Mahāvihāra was situated, as a means of identifying themselves with the Mahāvihāra.[4]

The Mahāvaṁsa, in explaining the name of the park referred to above, says 'at the time that the place was chosen for the garden, a great cloud, gathering at an unwonted season, poured forth rain; therefore they called the garden Mahāmeghavana'.[5] It was believed in ancient times that the king also possessed certain

---

1. Mv., chap. XV, vv. 14-15, vv. 24-25.

2. Mv., chap. XV, vv. 24-214.

3. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 241-247, 248-255; T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 212-227.

4. For details see T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

5. Mv., chap. XI, v. 3.

powers to cause rain at will even during a drought.[1] When a severe drought was causing distress to his people, Sirisaṁghabodhi (247-249) is said to have obtained rain by virtue of his observance of moral precepts.[2] Similarly, when there was a famine in the reign of Upatissa I (365-406), he is said to have overcome it by causing the rain to fall.[3] The Galpota Slab Inscription of Niśśaṅkamalla, though it belongs to the subsequent period, provides us with an illustrative example. 'He (Niśśaṅkamalla) possesses the powers of a lion-king, which can extract water from any spot he likes, for on one occasion when (travelling) in a waterless desert, the moment he entertained the thought "it would be well if there were water", there fell a shower of rain from an out of season cloud and produced an abundant stream'.[4] Hence, the concept that the king is 'the giver of rain' would

---

1. G. C. Mendis, The Early History of Ceylon, p. 33.

2. Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 75-79; Ẹḷu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya, p. 36; Pūjāvaliya, trans. B. Gunasekara, p. 23.

3. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 189-198.

4. E.Z., vol. II, p. 116.

probably have led to the adoption of the throne name (Siri) mekavaṇa or (Sala) mevan.[1]

Many kings of the period under survey appear to have born Buddhist names as their personal names. Accordingly, we hear of kings who were named Buddhadāsa, Saṁghatissa, Moggallāna, Kassapa and Mahinda.[2] It is of interest to note here the influence of Buddhist relics on the names of kings. The two most venerated relics of the Buddha were the Tooth Relic and the Bodhi Tree at Anurādhapura. There were many kings who compounded the word dāṭhā 'tooth' with their names, like Dāṭhāpabhūti, Dāṭhopatissa and Hatthadāṭha.[3] Similarly, the word bodhi was also added to the names of kings. There were nine rulers who bore the name Aggabodhi during the period under consideration.[4] Some added to their names the

---

1. See also T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., p. 96.

2. Cv., chap. 37, v. 105; chap. 39, v. 1, v. 28; chap. 44, v. 1, v. 22; chap. 48, v. 20, v. 26; chap. 49, v. 38; chap. 52, v. 1, v. 37; chap. 54, v. 7; chap. 55, v. 1.

3. Cv., chap. 41, v. 42; chap. 44, v. 128; chap. 45, v. 22; chap. 46, v. 45.

4. Cv., chap. 42, v. 1, v. 40; chap. 44, v. 83; chap. 46, v. 1; chap. 48, v. 39, v. 68; chap. 49, v. 43, v. 83.

word dhātu 'relic' without any specification, as in the case of Dhātusena[1] and Dappula.[2] The custom of adopting Buddhist names seems to have been followed only by the kings of our period. Out of the fifty-four kings[3] who held sway in the early Anurādhapura period, only two rulers appear to have born names of Buddhist origin. No Buddhist names appear among the royalty of the later period. This may clearly indicate the profound influence of Buddhism on society during the period under review. Therefore, it is not surprising that at a time when such ideas prevailed in society, the kings would also desire to assume titles of religious significance.

It is evident from the discussion above that the kings of our period generally assumed modest titles.[4]

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, v. 35.

2. This name occurs in the inscriptions of our period as Dāpuḷ or Dāpuḷu (see for instance, E.Z., vol. III, p. 127, p. 219). It has been pointed out by Paranavitana that Dāpuḷ or Dāpuḷu (P. Dappula) is a vernacular form and is made of dā 'relic' and puḷu 'born' (E.Z., vol. III, p. 224, n. 16).

3. The foreign usurpers are not included.

4. On the contrary, their counterparts in India adorned themselves with grandiose titles like paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja, rājādhirāja, parameśvara, parakeśari, rājakeśarī etc.

Apart from the official designations and generic terms, almost all the other titles appear to have a religious significance. This may indicate an attempt taken by the kings of our period to consolidate their power by identifying themselves with Buddhism.[1]

---

1. See pp. 293-314 below.

CHAPTER III

ROYAL FAMILY

The Part Played by Members of the Royal Family in the Administration and the Privileges They Enjoyed

The kings of the period under survey, with the exception of a few foreign rulers and usurpers, belong either to the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty or to the Moriya dynasty. The Lambakaṇṇa dynasty came to power with the accession of Vasabha in the second century A.D.[1] According to the Cūḷavaṁsa, Dhātusena (455-473) founded the first Moriya dynasty in Ceylon.[2]

The members of these two dynasties considered themselves to be of Kṣatriya origin[3] but this claim may not be genuine. The author of the Mahāvaṁsa denoted all the rulers of the first dynasty - from Vijaya up to

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXV, v. 59.
2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 14-35.
3. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 85-113, 185-190, 245-251; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 127-128.

Iḷanāga - as Kṣatriyas.[1] But, it is remarkable that neither the Mahāvaṁsa nor the Cūḷavaṁsa designates the kings of the Moriya and Lambakaṇṇa dynasties by the term Kṣatriya. The Dīpavaṁsa refers to only one king of the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty, Saṅghabodhi, as a Kṣatriya.[2] The Attanagaluvaṁsaya also calls the same king a Ksatriya.[3] These two works may have referred to Saṅghabodhi as a Kṣatriya because he was regarded as a 'holy king'.

It cannot be said with certainty how these two dynasties originated in Ceylon.[4] However, all the available evidence points to the fact that they were of Vaiśya origin. The Saddharmaratnākaraya, the Pärakumbāsirita and Kāvyaśekharaya,[5] all attributed to the fifteenth century, trace the origin of the Lambakaṇṇas back to the

---

1. The foreign usurpers and the temporary consorts of Anula are not included into this category.

2. Dv., chap. XXII, v. 53.

3. Attanagaluvaṁsaya, ed. Kumaranatunga, pp. 6, 19.

4. For a discussion for the possible origin of the Lambakaṇṇas, see H. Ellawala, Social History of Early Ceylon, pp. 34-35.

5. Saddharmaratnākaraya (1923), p. 296; Pärakumbāsirita, v. 10; Kāvyaśekharaya, ed. R. Dharmarama, pp. 229-231.

Bodhāhārakulas and connect them with Sumitta who was one of the eight princes that accompanied the Bodhi tree to the Island. The Mahābodhivaṁsa, which deals with the history of the Bodhi tree, states that these eight princes were the brothers of Aśoka's queen.[1] This work as well as Pūjāvaliya designate them as Ksatriyas.[2] But the queen of Aśoka, according to the Pāli sources, was the daughter of a Seṭṭhi of Vidisā or Veṭhisa.[3] The Setthis in Ceylon as well as in India normally belonged to the Vaiśya class.[4] Hence it would seem that as Aśoka's queen belonged to the Vaiśya class, her eight brothers headed by Sumitta were also Vaiśyas.[5] Therefore, if the tradition given in the later sources about the origin of the

---

1. Vedisadeviyā sahodarānam aṭṭhannam Khattiya kumārānaṁ aggaṁ Sumitta Bodhiguttābhidhānaṁ (Mahābodhivaṁsa, p. 154).

2. Ibid.; Pūjāvaliya, p. 721.

3. Samantapāsādikā, p. 34; Mahāvaṁsa, chap. XIII, v. 9; Mahābodhivaṁsa, p. 98; Sāratthadīpanī, p. 130.

4. H. Ellawala, Social History of Early Ceylon, pp. 43-44.

5. H. Ellawala, op. cit., p. 32.

Lambakaṇṇas is acceptable, it is far from unlikely that the rulers of this dynasty were of Vaiśya origin.

The Moriyas, who rose to power with the accession of Dhātusena, are considered to be a branch of the Indian Maurya dynasty.[1] There is no unanimity in the sources regarding the origin of the Mauryas in India. According to the Mudrārākṣasa and its commentary, Candragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty in India, was the son of Sarvārthasiddhi by his Śūdra wife, Murā.[2] The Greek writer Justin also confirms the low origin of Candragupta.[3] According to Jaina sources, he was the son of a village headman's daughter.[4] The Buddhist tradition, however, represents Candragupta as a scion of the Kṣatriya clan of the Moriyas of Pipphalīvana.[5] But there is no sufficient evidence to prove that the Moriyas in India were of Kṣatriya origin. It is not unlikely that the Buddhist tradition of the Kṣatriya origin of the Moriyas was a

---

1. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 113.

2. Mudrārākṣasa, ed. Devadhar and Bedekar, pp. 9, 11, 17; The Age of Imperial Unity, p. 55.

3. The Age of Imperial Unity, p. 55.

4. Ibid.; Bṛhatkathākośa, p. 327 ff.

5. Mv., chap. V, vv. 16-17; Vpk., vol. I, p. 180.

later invention. The Buddhist writers may have attempted to link the dynasty of their great benefactor, Aśoka, with a noble clan. On the other hand, a number of sources, as seen above, refer to them as of low birth. Therefore, it cannot be said with certainty if the Moriyas in Ceylon, who are regarded to be the descendants of the Moriyas in India, belonged to the Kṣatriya caste. On the strength of the evidence given above it may be reasonable to suppose that the Lambakaṇṇas as well as the Moriyas were not originally Kṣatriyas. But, with the passage of time the rulers of these two dynasties appear to have elevated themselves to the Kṣatriya class. This is evidenced by the claim recorded in their inscriptions, according to which they were 'descendants of the Okkāka dynasty, pinnacle of the Kṣatriya clan'.[1] Moreover, as revealed by the Pāli records, Buddhist society in India considered that all kings and other officials of the state belonged to the Kṣatriya caste.[2] A similar belief seems to have

---

1. Siribar kät kula kot Okāvas rad parapuren bat (E.Z., vol. I, pp. 85-113, 185-190; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 74-81, 127-128; E.Z., vol. IV, pp. 62-67). See also Lakshman S. Perera, 'The Royal Lineage in the Prasastis of the eighth - tenth century Inscriptions', The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. II, nos. 3 and 4 (1953), pp. 230-236.

2. Dīgha Nikāya, vol. I, p. 136.

existed in Ceylon. Therefore, it appears that whatever the origin of the rulers, they were considered by common consent to be of Ksatriya lineage.

Next to the king comes the queen, the mahesi - chief consort.[1] The kings of Ceylon like most of the Indian rulers had several consorts, but the chief one among them was his mahesi or the consecrated queen who was invariably - and perhaps necessarily - of royal or Ksatriya lineage. Equality of birth is not so strictly enforced in the case of the other consorts of the king. According to the Cūlavaṁsa, Dhātusena (455-473)had a wife of unequal birth. Of the two sons of Dhātusena it is stated that Kassapa was born by a mother of unequal birth (bhinnamātuka)[2] and Moggallāna by a mother of equal birth (samānamātuka).[3] But it is not clear what exactly was meant by the term bhinnamātuka in this context. The term bhinna could mean 'different caste' as well as 'different race' or 'different religion'.

---

1. Pali - English Dictionary, P.T.S., s.v. 'mahesi'.

2. The word bhinna means split, different, opposed to samāna etc. Therefore the term bhinnamātuka could also mean 'non-Sinhalese mother'.

3. Cv., chap. 38, v. 80.

Most probably only the sons born of a queen of equal birth as the king had a right to the throne.[1] Many inscriptions which give the genealogies of kings take special care to mention that the mother of a particular king was of the same caste as his father.[2] Mahinda IV (956-972) is described in one of his inscriptions as 'the great king Siri Saṅgboy Abahay, who was born unto the great king Abahay Salamevan, an eminent Kṣatriya, being descended from the line of the Okkāka dynasty, which is the pinnacle of the illustrious Kṣatriya race, having been conceived in the womb of the anointed queen Dev Gon of equal birth in the same (Kṣatriya) race'.[3] If a prince born to a king from a wife other than of Kṣatriya blood happened to occupy the throne, he was

---

1. This is made clear by a remark made by Vikkamabāhu II, a ruler of the succeeding period, regarding his two sons: 'To win unachieved and to keep achieved advantage this my son Gajabāhu will in no case be able. And my other son Mahinda, though gifted with heroic courage and other excellent qualities, stands lower owing to his mother's origin and is unworthy of the crown' (Cv., chap. 62, vv. 58-60).

2. . . . emä kulen samadä, see E.Z., vol. I, pp. 91, 186, 225, 237; E.Z., vol. II, pp. 53, 67; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 75, 139, 222.

3. Siri-bar käta-kula kot Okā-vas-raj-parapuren bat käta usab Abahay Salamevan maharaj-haṭ eme kulen samajāy Dev-Gon-bisev-räjna kusä ipädä (E.Z., vol. I, p. 111).

considered a usurper rather than a rightful successor, and very often such rulers seem to have had untimely deaths. For instance, Sotthisena, the son of Mahānāma (406-428) by a Tamil consort, was murdered on the very day of his accession and the throne passed to the husband of Saṁghā, Mahānāma's daughter by his Kṣatriya queen.[1] Kassapa I (473-491) was led to the murder of his father Dhātusena owing to the fact that he had, in the natural course of events, no expectation of succeeding his father as his mother was of a different caste or race whereas his younger brother Moggallāna was favoured as one born of a mother equal to the father in birth.[2]

On the strength of the evidence given above it may be reasonable to suggest that at this period descent from a mother of royal birth was also considered necessary to be an heir to the throne. The custom of tracing descent from the mother's side became well established in the period that follows.[3] The emphasis given to the mother's birth as revealed by the instances discussed above would indicate that the initial stages

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 1-3.

2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 80 ff.

3. S. Paranavitana, 'Matrilineal Descent in the Sinhalese Royal Family', C.J.Sc., Section G, vol. II, 1928-33, pp. 235-240.

of this custom were seen in the period under survey.

The title of the king's consort was mahesi. The investiture of the queen was a solemn ceremony and the queen, too, was consecrated like the king. The queen's consecration may have followed in all probability immediately that of the king and was performed by the king himself with as much solemnity as his own. It was essential that the king should be consecrated with the queen, who had to be of Kṣatriya lineage like he himself.[1] When Sena II (853-887) became king, he consecrated Saṁghā, who had been his wife since he was an uparāja, as his mahesi.[2] Similarly, Kassapa IV (898-914) consecrated as chief queen the princess Tissā who was his consort.[3]

---

1. Even the legendary king Vijaya is said to have refused consecration unless a maiden of a Kṣatriya caste was consecrated as queen at the same time (Mv., chap. VII, v. 47). Cf. also Mv., chap. VIII, v. 17 and Saddharmaratnāvaliya where it is explicitly said that queens 'are necessary for consecration' (Saddharmaratnāvaliya, p. 980).

2. Bhariyā tassa yā āsi Saṁghā, taṁ so'bhisecayi mahesibhāve datvāna parihāraṁ yathābhataṁ (Cv., chap. 51, v. 6).

3. Aggābhisekaṁ dāpesi yuvarājassa dhītuyā rājakaññāya Tissāya bhariyāy'eva attano (Cv., chap. 52, v. 2).

Most probably the title of mahesi was bestowed on the queen only after consecration as the chief consort of the king.[1] Mahinda II (777-797) married the widow of his predecessor, Aggabodhi VII (772-777).[2] It is noteworthy that the title of mahesi has been applied to her only after she became the queen-consort of Mahinda II.[3] Before that she is referred to only by the term devī, a title of politeness used in addressing or referring to the consorts of the king.[4]

The term Biso räjnä (variant - bisevä, Skt., abhiṣikta rājñī) occurs in a number of inscriptions of the period under survey to denote the chief-consort of the king. This term may have been used to distinguish the anointed chief queen from the other consorts of the king, who bore the simple title of rājinī or devī. In the Mädirigiriya and Bilibäva Pillar Inscriptions, Kassapa V (914-923) refers to the queen consort of Sena II (853-887) as debisevä 'twice-anointed queen'.[5] In a number

---

1. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 118.
2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 113.
3. Ibid., v. 120.
4. Ibid., vv. 85, 86, 89, 92.
5. E.Z., vol. II, p. 30, p. 41.

of inscriptions attributed to Mahinda IV (956-972), the term bisev-räjna is used to denote the queen consort of Silāmeghavaṇṇa Abhaya.[1]

The queen seldom or never interfered in the administration of the country but she took an active part in the religious work carried out by the king. She had her own revenues from villages allotted to her,[2] which she not infrequently spent in the cause of religion, endowing or building or renovating places of worship. The queen-consort of Aggabodhi II (604-614) built the Kapāla-nāga monastery and handed it over, provided with the four necessaries, to the Abhayagiri vihāra.[3] The queen of Aggabodhi IV (667-683) not only built a vihāra for the bhikkhunīs but granted it two villages together with a hundred monastery helpers.[4] Senā, the queen of Udaya I (797-801), built the Katthaka cetiya on the Cetiya-pabbata, as also the rock temple Jayasena, which she gave to the

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 91, 221, 234; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 67.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 61; chap. 51, v. 6.

3. Cv., chap. 42, v. 65.

4. Cv., chap. 46, v. 27.

Tamil bhikkhus together with the village Mahummāra. She also restored the Giribhaṇḍa vihāra and set apart villages for the maintenance of the bhikkhus who resided in that vihāra.[1] It is evident from these references that the queen, too, had the right to make land-grants at her wish. However, no inscriptional evidence is available with respect to any of the land-grants made by the queens of this period.

The title bestowed on the royal princes of the period under consideration was ëpā or ādipāda.[2] It is remarkable that the title is not met with in the Mahāvaṁsa, i.e., in the first part of the chronicle which narrates the history of the early period, nor in the modern portions of the chronicle after chapter LXXIX. Thus it would appear that the title belongs exclusively to the medieval period, i.e., from the fourth to the thirteenth century. In clarifying the term ādipāda Geiger remarks that this term means 'one who has the first post, who marches in front'.[3] Paranavitana is of opinion that the word ādipāda represents an erroneous rendering into Pāli of the

---

1. Cv., chap. 49, vv. 23-29.

2. A term found neither in Sanskrit nor in the Pāli canon.

3. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 120.

Sinhalese word äpā.[1] The term seems to have been formed by the addition of the honorific suffix paya (Skt. pāda) to the title of aya which appears not infrequently in the inscriptions of the early Anurādhapura period to denote royal princes.[2]

The title of äpā or ādipāda came into vogue at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. Silākāla (518-531) bestowed the rank of ādipāda on his eldest son Moggallāna and handed over to him Puratthimadesa 'the Eastern Province'.[3] Udaya I (797-801) made his eldest son yuvarāja and the other sons ādipādas.[4] Similarly, Mahinda IV (956-972) bestowed the title of ādipāda on his sons and that of rājinī on his daughter.[5] In the reign of Sena I (833-853), his brothers Udaya and Kassapa are said to have borne the title of ādipāda.[6] The same

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 366; see pp. 97-100 below.

2. C.J.Sc., vol. II, p. 115.

3. datvā ṭhānantaraṁ c'ādipādasaññaṁ . . . (Cv., chap. 41, vv. 33-34).

4. Adāsi yuvarājattaṁ jeṭṭhaputtassa attano ādipāde pare 'kāsi rājinī pi ca dhītaro (Cv., chap. 49, v. 3).

5. Ādipāde akā putte dhītaraṁ cāpi rājiniṁ (Cv., chap. 54, v. 11).

6. Cv., chap. 50, vv. 8, 25.

title was held by Dappula in the reign of his brother Dappula III (923-924).[1] The title of äpā is frequently met with in the inscriptions of this period.[2] Hence it appears that the title of äpā or ādipāda was bestowed on almost all the princes of the royal family. Similarly, the princesses were given the title of rājinī.[3]

But it should be noted here that a prince does not become an ādipāda simply by right, but by the decision of the king, who had the right of conferring it upon them.[4] Dappula II (815-831) did not make the son of his eldest brother, Mahinda, ādipāda because he wanted to secure the crown for his own sons.[5] According to the law of succession that prevailed in the country, Mahinda as the son of the eldest brother had a right to the throne. But Dappula, in order to ensure the succession for his own sons, refused to confer the title of ādipāda on Mahinda. Thus it appears that the title of ādipāda

---

1. Cv., chap. 53, v. 1.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, p. 91, p. 221; E.Z., vol. II, pp. 57-63; E.Z., vol. IV, pp. 169-176; E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 137; pt. II, p. 185, p. 276.

3. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 123.

4. Cv., chap. 41, vv. 33-34.

5. Cv., chap. 49, v. 84.

was a necessary prerequisite for any claim to the throne. An ä̈pā or ādipāda, in the ordinary course, was elevated to the rank of māpā, the next step being sovereignty.[1] Thus a king graduated to that exalted position from the dignities of ä̈pā and māpā, but there are instances in which some princes were created ä̈pā and māpā on their birth.[2]

Generally the ādipādas were entrusted with the administration of certain provinces. Silākāla is said to have handed over Puratthimadesa 'the Eastern Province' to his eldest son after conferring on him the title of ādipāda.[3] But from about the eighth century Puratthimadesa was no more the administrative seat of the ādipāda. This is suggested by the fact that Aggabodhi VI (733-772) assigned Rohaṇa but not Puratthimadesa to ādipāda Dappula.[4] From that time onwards, the practice of assigning Rohaṇa to the ādipāda continued up to the end of the Polonnaruva period. Although this practice was in abeyance during

---

1. Ä̈pā mahayā siri vida piḷivela se radä päminä (E.Z., vol. III, p. 75).
2. See E.Z., vol. I, p. 43.
3. Cv., chap. 41, v. 34.
4. Cv., chap. 48, v. 90.

the period of Coḷa occupation, it was revived by Vijayabāhu I after he unified the Island and established himself at Polonnaruva.[1]

It is not easy to determine the precise duties and functions carried out by the ādipāda as a viceroy of Rohaṇa. The evidence available in the sources is rather inadequate to form a clear idea of them. However, it is not unlikely that the king expected the prince who was in control of Rohaṇa to look after the king's subjects and maintain law and order in that province. This is made clear by the account given in the Cūḷavaṁsa with regard to ādipāda Mahinda's rule in Rohaṇa. 'He ensured that the people who had been oppressed during the previous reign recovered; he restored the Sāsana, which had also been injured by the former ruler, to the place befitting it'.[2] He is also said to have laid out numerous fruit and flower gardens, built tanks by damming up the Mahānadī and kept the maṇḍalīkas and raṭṭhiyas under

---

1. Cv., chap. 59, v. 12.

2. Cv., chap. 51, v. 120.

control.[1]

As the viceroy of Rohaṇa, the ādipāda also had to supervise the collection of royal dues in that province. Ādipāda Dāṭhāsiva is described in the chronicle as the administrator of revenue of Rohaṇa.[2] It was also the duty of the ādipāda to lead the royal troops, stationed in his province, in battle when it became necessary to quell a revolt or other disturbances there.[3]

The Cūḷavaṁsa represents ādipāda Dappula, who was the viceroy of Rohaṇa during the reign of Mahinda II (777-797), as a prince who had a large army at his disposal.[4] This prince invaded Anurādhapura more than once. Shortly after the accession of Kassapa IV (898-914), his yuvarāja's son ādipāda Mahinda, the viceroy of Rohaṇa during that time, led his army against Anurādhapura.[5] It is evident from the references given above that the

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, vv. 121-123.
2. Rohaṇadesamhi bhogādhipati (Cv., chap. 49, v. 10).
3. Cv., chap. 51, v. 123.
4. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 90-99.
5. Cv., chap. 52, vv. 4-7.

ādipāda had his own retinue of warriors and this, coupled with the authority over Rohaṇa, gave him the necessary power even to challenge the paramount ruler at Anurādhapura.

The ādipāda seems to have enjoyed the right to make land-grants in the province under his control. An inscription at Rāssahela records a land-grant made by ādipāda Dāṭhāsiva during the reign of Mahinda II (777-797).[1] Ādipāda Mahinda, who was appointed governor of Rohaṇa during the reign of Udaya II (887-898), claims in his Kirinda Pillar Inscription that he allocated villages to Tiaram-radmaha-vehera (P. Tissamahārāma).[2] The Devundara Pillar Inscription records a land-grant made by ādipāda Kittaggabodhi to a monastery there.[3] The Mayilagastoṭa Pillar Inscription contains references to a land-grant made by ādipāda Mahinda to a monastery at Māgama.[4]

The kings of this period granted immunities in respect of lands belonging to religious establishments

---

1. E.Z., vol. IV, pp. 169-176.
2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, pp. 276-278.
3. A.S.C.M., VI, pp. 61-63.
4. E.Z., vol. II, pp. 57-63.

and public institutions.[1] The king seems to have entrusted his viceroy in Rohaṇa, ādipāda, with this right. The Devundara Pillar Inscription of ādipāda Kittaggabodhi, the Mayilagastoṭa Pillar Inscription of ādipāda Mahinda and the Kirinda Pillar Inscription of ādipāda Mahinda[2] produce evidence of the immunities granted by these ādipādas in respect of lands belonging to religious institutions. There is no reference whatsoever in these epigraphs to suggest that the immunities were granted by the ādipādas after the prior sanction of the king.

Although the ādipāda had the right to issue edicts granting lands and also immunities in respect of those lands without reference to the king, he did not possess any right to date those edicts in his own regnal years. This is evident from the fact that none of the inscriptions of ādipādas found in Rohaṇa is dated in a regnal year other than that of the king.

As stated above the title of äpā was applied in general to the royal princes of this period. The most

---

1. See pp. 262-269 below.

2. A.S.C.M., VI, pp. 61-63; E.Z., vol. II, pp. 57-63; E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, pp. 276-278.

senior among the princes who had been created äpā was known as mahayā or mahapā or mahādipāda.[1] The title of mahādipāda occurs for the first time in the Cūḷavaṁsa during the reign of Aggabodhi I (571-604). Aggabodhi conferred the title of mahādipāda on his sister's son who later became his successor.[2] Although the specific term mahādipāda appears for the first time in the latter half of the sixth century A.D., its origin can be traced back to many centuries earlier.

In order to get a clearer idea of the origin and the formation of the term mahapā or mahādipāda it would be useful to take into account the titles given to the princes of the early Anurādhapura period. In many of the earliest inscriptions the sons of kings are referred to with the title aya (Skt. ārya, P. ayya) attached to the name either preceding or following it.[3] One of the

---

1. The two titles of äpā and mahayā - Sinhalese equivalents of the Pāli words ādipāda and mahādipāda used in the Cūḷavaṁsa - were generally regarded as corruptions of the Pāli words in question until Paranavitana pointed out the possibility of those Pāli terms to have been mistranslations of the Sinhalese terms. See E.Z., vol. V, p. 189, n. 3.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 38, v. 40.

3. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 3, no. 29; p. 2, no. 13; p. 31, no. 396; p. 42, nos. 549, 550, 551.

inscriptions at Mihintale refers to aya Siva, son of Devanapiya maharaja Gamaṇi Abaya.[1] In some of the inscriptions at Ämbulaṁbe, Central Province, a son of Pacina raja named raja Aba and his son Tisa aya are mentioned.[2] The Bōvattegala inscriptions in Pānampattu area refer to an aya Abaya, son of raja Uti.[3] In the Mahāvaṁsa, Uttiya, the brother of the king of Kälaṇiya, is called an ayya.[4] These references would make it clear that the title of aya (P. ayya) was used to denote the princes of Anurādhapura royal family as well as the sons of the local rulers in the early Anurādhapura period. Therefore, it is quite likely that the title of äpā, which occurs in the period under survey to denote royal princes,

---

1. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 3, no. 29.

2. A.I.C., p. 35, no. 34, revised U.C.R., VII, p. 240.

3. C.J.Sc., vol. II, p. 115; S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 42, no. 550.

4. Mv., chap. XXII, v. 13. The title aya (P. ayya, Skt. ārya) denotes a close resemblance to aya puta or ayya-putta (Skt. ārya-putra) in the Minor Rock Edicts of Aśoka. Ayaputa is the title by which royal princes, governors of provinces are referred to in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Suvaṇṇagirīte ayyaputtassa mahāmattāṇam ca vacanena 'From Suvaṇṇagiri, by order of the Ārya-putra and the ministers' (C.I.I., vol. I, p. 175).

was formed by adding the honorific suffix paya or pā (Skt. pāda) to the princely title aya of the early period.[1]

A number of inscriptions at Rājagala mention maha aya and Tisa aya, the sons of Devanapiya maharaja Gamaṇi Abaya.[2] The term mahaya is also found in a second-century inscription from Vessagiriya[3] and in a record from Kandegamakanda.[4] The title maha aya which is used in the above Rājagala inscriptions to denote one of the sons of Devanapiya Abaya bears a close resemblance to the title of mahayā in the inscriptions of our period.[5] Hence it can be inferred that the title of mahayā is a contraction of the

---

1. The word ayapaya thus formed was contracted to ǟpā: aya + paya > ayipaya > ayipā > ǟpā. The intermediate form ayipaya is preserved in a tenth century inscription. See E.Z., vol. I, p. 234.

2. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, p. 33, nos. 422, 423, 424, 425 and 426.

3. Mahayaha (kani) maha (la) ka Asalayaha dini (E.Z., vol. I, p. 21).

4. Ceylon Antiquary, vol. III, p. 209.

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, p. 186, p. 221; E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 137; pt. II, p. 185.

compound maha-aya, and mahapā that of maha-aya-paya or maha-äpā.[1] The honorific suffix paya or pā is a later addition to the title of aya of the early period. With the growth of power and prestige, the paramount rulers of our period may have tried to make the princely title more elaborate and grandiose by adding the honorific suffix paya to the less pretentious title aya of the early centuries.

The title of mahapā occurs in the Cūlavaṁsa as mahādipāda, which seems to be an erroneous rendering into Pāli of the Sinhalese word mahapā whereas the accurate form ought to have been maha-ayya-pāda. It is likely, as Paranavitana points out, that the author of the Cūlavaṁsa in giving the Sinhalese words a Pāli garb misunderstood the etymology of the word ä.[2]

It is evident from the discussion above that mahayā as well as äpā have originated from the princely

---

1. (i) maha + aya > mahāya > mahāyā > mahayā. The term māyā is met with in the later period.

   (ii) maha + ayapaya > mahapaya > mahapay > mahapā > māpā. The intermediate form mahapaya occurs in the Jetavanārama Inscription of Mahinda IV. ayipaya mahapayà siri viňdä (E.Z., vol. I, p. 234).

   (iii) maha + äpā > mahäpā > mahapā > māpā. The term mahäparadānan occurs in a ninth century inscription (E.Z., vol. III, p. 128).

2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 82. In explaining this Paranavitana

title aya of the early period. Thus etymologically mahayā or mahapā means 'the great prince'.[1] Among the princes who held the rank of äpā, the one who was intended by the reigning monarch to be his successor appears to have been distinguished by the title maha-äpā or mahayā, i.e., the chief among the äpās; and apparently the title has the same connotation as 'heir-apparent'.

The mere fact of royal birth did not entitle a prince to be called mahayā. He was invested with the dignity by the reigning monarch in a solemn manner. Thus Aggabodhi I (571-604) conferred the dignity of mahādipāda on his sister's son who was likewise called Aggabodhi.[2] After the death of mahādipāda Mahinda, Sena I (833-853) appointed his youngest brother Udaya to that post.[3] Sena II (853-887) also appointed a prince by the name of

---

says 'that as the word ä corresponding to Sanskrit ārya and Pāli or Prakrit ayya had become obsolete in his time and as a word ä representing the Pāli ādi was in common use, he adopted ādipāda as equivalent of äpā and mahādipāda as the equivalent of mahapā'.

1. E.Z., vol. III, p. 82.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 38.

3. Bhātaraṁ dutiyaṁ katvā Udayaṁ nāma Khattiyaṁ mahādipādaṁ tassādā bhogatthaṁ Dakkhiṇaṁ disaṁ (Cv., chap. 50, v. 44).

Udaya as mahādipāda.[1] Udaya II (887-898) raised his youngest brother Kassapa to the rank of mahādipāda,[2] who in the sequel became his successor. The investiture of the mahādipāda seems to have been accompanied by an official ceremony and the mahayā, too, was consecrated like the king.[3] It is noteworthy that even the princes who had been created äpās did not exercise the right to assume of their own accord the title of mahayā. An äpā in the ordinary course was elevated to the rank of mahayā by the reigning monarch himself.[4] Hence the kings of this period have very often stated in their inscriptions that they graduated to the sovereignty through the ranks of äpā and mahayā;[5] 'having enjoyed the ranks of äpā and mahayā attained to sovereignty in regular succession'.[6] Thus it would appear that in order to have a

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, v. 63.

2. . . . kaniṭṭhaṁ sakabhātaraṁ mahādipādaṭṭhānamhi ṭhapi (Cv., chap. 51, v. 91).

3. Cv., Introduction, p. XVIII.

4. See for instance, Cv., chap. 50, v. 8 and v. 44.

5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, p. 91, p. 221, p. 234; E.Z., vol. II, p. 53, p. 67; E.Z., vol. III, p. 75, p. 139.

6. äpā mahayā siri viňdä pilivelasey raj vä (E.Z., vol. I, p. 91).

legitimate claim to the throne, it was necessary to have been previously created a mahapā as well as an äpā. But in unsettled times, enterprising aspirants to the throne may have assumed of their own accord the title of mahayā, as was done by Vijayabāhu I.[1]

As heir to the throne the mahayā was also called yuvarāja. These two titles seem to have been used alternately to denote the heir-apparent of our period.[2] Princes who are referred to in the chronicle as the yuvarāja in a particular reign are styled mahayā or its variants - mahapā or māpā - in the inscriptions of that reign. Udaya III (935-938) who held the title of yuvarāja in Dappula's reign[3] is styled mahayā in his Puliyankulam Slab Inscription.[4] Moreover, in this inscription also occurs the phrase äpā yuva-rad bisev tanä pämänä instead of the more frequent äpā mahayā siri viňdä.[5] As the title of yuvarāja

---

1. Cv., chap. 58, vv. 1-7.
2. See for instance Cv., chap. 50, vv. 6, 10.
3. Cv., chap. 53, v. 4.
4. Udā mahayā pin siri-sar tumā (E.Z., vol. I, p. 186).
5. E.Z., vol. I, p. 186.

is used in place of the term mahayā, it becomes apparent that very often these two titles were held by the same prince. Hence, it appears that mahayā is the normal designation given to the heir-apparent of the period under consideration. But there are recorded instances in which there were two different princes holding these two offices, as for example in the reign of Udaya II (887-898).[1]

The mahapā, too, was entrusted with the administration of a certain province. He had as his domain Dakkhiṇadesa, the Southern country, not of the Island but of the Anurādhapura kingdom, i.e., that part of the Island between Kalā Oya and Kalu Gaṅga.[2] Sena I (833-853), after conferring the dignity of mahayā on Udaya, assigned him the territory of Dakkhiṇadesa.[3] A number of inscriptions found in various sites of this province contain edicts issued by princes who had the title of

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, vv. 91-98.

2. H. W. Codrington, 'Notes on Ceylon Topography in the twelfth century', J.R.A.S.C.B., XXIX, no. 75 (1922), p. 62 ff.; see also C. W. Nicholas, 'The Territorial divisions of Ceylon from early times to the twelfth century', U.C.R., vol. IX, no. I (1951), pp. 20-51.

3. Cv., chap. 50, v. 45.

mahayā.[1] The practice of assigning this part of the Island to the mahayā was so well established in the ninth and tenth centuries, that this territory came to be known as the Māyāraṭa in later times.[2] The äpā, as seen above, had Rohaṇa as his administrative seat. Thus it is clear that the three kingdoms into which the Island is said to have been divided in ancient times[3] were really the territory under the direct rule of the king at Anurādhapura, that of the heir-apparent and the domain of the äpā, the prince next in succession after the mahayā. Although Rohaṇa and Dakkhiṇadesa were assigned to the äpā and mahapā respectively, these princes may not necessarily have resided within those territories.[4] It is possible that some of them had the apanage administered through a high dignitary living in that province and visited the territory when it became necessary to quell a rebellion

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 182; E.Z., vol. II, p. 14; E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289, p. 299; E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 345.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 366.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 367.

or some such occasion.

Not sufficient data are available in the sources regarding the duties and functions assigned to the mahapā as viceroy of Dakkhiṇadesa. Although there are a number of inscriptions which embody edicts issued by princes who bore the title of mahayā, almost all of these epigraphs refer only to the religious donations made by them.[1] Therefore, one may have to draw a parallel between the duties of the king and the mahapā in order to get some idea of the duties connected with the latter. The main duty of the king, as expounded in the chronicle and in the inscriptions of this period, was to protect his subjects from various enemies, within and without, and to promote the welfare of the country. It is not unlikely that as the representative of the king in Dakkhiṇadesa, the mahapā was also expected to perform similar duties in his territory. It can also be inferred that in his capacity as the viceroy of Dakkhiṇadesa, the mahapā had to maintain law and order there. Therefore, it was his duty to lead the royal troops, stationed in his province, into battle when it became necessary to quell a revolt or other

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 186; E.Z., vol. II, p. 14; E.Z., vol. III, p. 128; E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 121; pt. II, p. 289; pt. III, p. 345.

disturbances there. Apart from such civil riots, the mahapā was also responsible for settling disputes in religious establishments of his territory.[1]

In the government of the country, the king was assisted by a Council of State (sabhā). But there is no sufficient evidence to ascertain how this sabhā was constituted and what its powers and functions were. From one document, however, we learn that the sabhā included an institution called the lekamgē 'the house of secretaries or scribes' whose duty it was to draft the edicts issued in the name of the king.[2] The mahapā, too, had a sabhā of his own to assist him with the administration of his territory.[3] The mahapā's council (sabhā), it appears, corresponded in many ways to the Council of State at Anurādhapura. The members of the king's council as well as the mahayā's sabhā were referred to as sam-daru,[4]

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 190.

2. See Badulla Pillar Inscription, E.Z., vol. V, pt. II p. 185; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 372.

3. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289; E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 352.

4. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 331. Svāmi + daru > sāmidaru > samdaru. Further development gives handuru.

literally 'the son of a lord', i.e., 'officers of the king'. It is not possible to determine whether all the officers who helped the mahayā in the administration of his domain figured as members of his council (sabhā). Some of the inscriptions found in various sites of the ancient Dakkhiṇadesa contain the names and the designations of the officers who came to enforce the decrees of the mahayā. The officers thus mentioned are mey-kāppar vädārum[1] 'commander of the body-guard', maha-le arak-samaṇa[2] 'chief-secretary', ledeṭu (P. lekhaka) 'secretary' and kuḍasalā[3] to which vatkämi[4] 'officers in charge of

---

1. This seems to be a title of Tamil origin. See E.Z., vol. I, p. 38, n. 2.

2. Araksamaṇa, occuring in some records in the form of raksamaṇa (E.Z., vol. III, p. 198), is an official title given to the chief secretary (mahale). The variant form araksämiyā occurs in a pillar inscription from Sīgiriya (A.S.C., Annual Report (1911-1912), p. 108). This shows that the second member of the above compound is formed of sāmi (Skt. svāmin) with the addition of the honorific suffix aṇa and means 'master'. Arak represents Sanskrit ārakṣaka 'a guard' or 'protector' and therefore the word araksamaṇa means the 'Chief-guardian'. If the mahale was in charge of the treasury of the king as Paranavitana has suggested, this title might have been applied to him in that capacity.

3. Kuḍasalā occurs as a title of some of the officials who appear in the capacity of dūtakas or messengers in the pillar edicts of the ninth and tenth centuries. It is worthy of note that the officers who are distinguished by this title are very often represented as coming under the authority of the chief secretary.

4. Vat may be equated with Sanskrit vārtā which in the

agriculture' was at times appended.[1] Of these mey-kāppar vädärum 'commander of the body-guard' and mahale arak samaṇa, who had a status corresponding to that of the ājñapti in Indian grants, may have functioned as members of the mahayā's council.[2] The other subordinate officers - dūtakas as they may be styled - who were instrumental in promulgating the edicts may not have belonged to the Council.

As viceroy of Dakkhiṇadesa and heir-apparent, the mahapā seems to have enjoyed certain rights and privileges. The mahapā had the right to make land-grants in his territory. The Nägama Pillar Inscription records a grant of land made by mahapā Udaya during the reign of Sena II (853-887).[3] The Vihāregama Pillar Inscription registers the gift of a piece of land by a mahapā.[4] The Aturupolayagama

---

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭalya denotes 'economics'in general, i.e., agriculture and cattle breeding. Therefore, vatkämi may mean officers in charge of agriculture.

1. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289, p. 299; pt. III, p. 355, p. 365, p. 384.

2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 376; E.Z., vol. III, p. 110. The ājñapti is the foremost officer who conveys the king's command. In Indian documents the ājñapti is very often the commander of the military forces and sometimes the king's private secretary.

3. E.Z., vol. II, p. 14.

4. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 53.

Pillar Inscription[1] and the Dorabawila Pillar Inscription[2] also provide evidence in support of such grants made by mahapās of the period under survey.

Like the supreme ruler, the mahapā also possessed the right to grant immunities in respect of lands set aside for a religious establishment or a public institution. The Puliyankuḷam Slab Inscription of mahapā Udaya;[3] the Sīgiriya Pillar Inscription of mahapā Kassapa;[4] the Dorabawila Pillar Inscription of mahapā Dappula;[5] the Viraṅdagoḍa Pillar Inscription of mahapā Mahinda;[6] the Iṅginimiṭiya Pillar Inscription of mahapā Kassapa;[7] the Viyaulpota Pillar Inscription of mahapā Mahinda[8] and the Gonnāva Devāle Pillar Inscription of mahapā Udaya[9] all

---

1. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 384.
2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 279.
3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 186.
4. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 351.
5. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289.
6. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 121.
7. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 355.
8. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 179.
9. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 189.

indicate that these mahapās were able to make immunity grants in respect of the lands assigned to various religious and public establishments. On some occasions they granted immunities in respect of the lands donated by the rulers at Anurādhapura.[1] It is noteworthy that in granting these immunities the mahapās do not appear to have sought the prior sanction of the paramount ruler at Anurādhapura.

The mahapā, however, did not enjoy the right to date documents in his own regnal years. Invariably, an edict embodying an order of the mahapā is dated in the regnal years of the paramount ruler at Anurādhapura. Thus mahapā Udaya,[2] mahapā Kassapa[3] and mahapā Dappula[4] have dated their edicts in the regnal years of the supreme ruler at Anurādhapura. But the Viraṅdagoḍa Pillar Inscription which registers a grant made by the mahayā Mahinda is not dated in this particular manner.[5] The document

---

1. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289; E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 355.
2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 14.
3. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 355.
4. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 289.
5. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 121.

is dated in the third year with no indication of any authority higher than the mahayā whose order is embodied in it. Hence, it may be concluded that the third year was that of mahayā Mahinda himself. Mahayā Mahinda of this inscription, therefore, appears to have dated documents in his own regnal years without reference to a sovereign ruler. But this mahayā can be identified with the ruler mentioned in the Cūlavaṁsa[1] who carried out the duties of a king, bearing the title of äpā and without assuming the paraphernalia of the royal office.[2] Therefore, the mahayā mentioned in the Viraňdagoḍa Pillar Inscription has to be taken as a sovereign ruler who carried out the functions of a king under the title of mahayā. Hence it is reasonable to infer that the mahayās as well as äpās who functioned as viceroys of Dakkhiṇadesa and Rohaṇa respectively did not possess any right to date

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 26-31. According to the Cūlavaṁsa, prince Mahinda refrained from maintaining the pomp and splendour of kingship as he had been mourning the loss of a dear friend when he became entitled to the throne.

2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 121.

edicts in their own regnal years.

Another designation conferred on some members of the royal family was uparāja. The precise meaning of the term uparāja is not easy to determine as it has been used in the chronicle in two different senses. The title of uparāja appears sometimes to have been synonymous with yuvarāja[1] but there are also recorded instances when these two titles were borne by different princes.[2] Therefore, in order to clarify the relation of the term uparāja to that of yuvarāja it is necessary to trace the history of these two titles from the earliest times.

The title of uparāja was not unknown to Indian literature, though the literary usage with regard to this title is not reflected in the inscriptions. It frequently occurs in the canonical Pāli literature. For instance, the Aṅguttara Nikāya records that 'the eldest son of a king, if he has the five necessary qualifications, makes viceroyalty (uparajjaṁ) his aim'.[3] The term is also met

---

1. Cv., chap. 44, v. 84, v. 123, v. 124, vv. 137 and 144; chap. 48, v. 69, v. 75.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 6.

3. Aṅguttara Nikāya, III, p. 154.

with in the Sumangalavilāsinī,[1] in the Dhammapada commentary,[2] and in the Jātakas.[3] It is noteworthy that the title uparāja occurs in the Pāli as well as in the Sanskrit literature in the sense of a viceroy, a secondary or deputy king.[4]

The title of yuvarāja does not occur in Pāli literature except in the Cūḷavaṁsa. It denotes a 'young king', an heir-apparent associated with the reigning king in the government, or a crown-prince.[5] It is in this latter sense that the term is often used in Sanskrit literature.[6]

From the above enumeration it becomes clear that the titles of uparāja and yuvarāja differ from one other in their original meaning and that uparāja is not used

---

1. Sumangalavilāsinī, vol. I, p. 134.
2. Dhammapadatthakathā, vol. I, p. 392.
3. Jātaka, I, p. 504; Jātaka, II, p. 316.
4. Pali - English Dictionary, P.T.S.; Pāṇini, IV, 2. 116.
5. Sanskrit - English Dictionary, Monier Williams.
6. T. Goldstücker, English - Sanskrit Vocabulary, pp. 281-282; Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyākāṇḍa, cc. 1-17; Yuddhakāṇḍa, c. 112; Kalpasūtra, ed. Jacobi, p. 74.

as a parallel term to yuvarāja. It is not clear whether the term uparāja was used in Ceylon in its older sense as found in Pāli and Sanskrit literature or whether it carried a different connotation.

It is remarkable that only the term uparāja is met with in the Pāli chronicles and the epigraphic records of the early Anurādhapura period. It occurs for the first time in the Mahāvaṁsa in the narrative of Aśoka.[1] It is said that Aśoka had his youngest brother Tissa consecrated to the office of uparāja.[2] The legendary king Vijaya is said to be the eldest son and uparāja of Sīhabāhu.[3] Paṇḍuvāsudeva consecrated his eldest son Abhaya as uparāja and this uparāja ascended the throne at his father's death.[4] The uparāja of Devānampiya Tissa was his younger brother Mahānāga.[5] The king's consort who

---

1. Mv., chap. V, v. 33, v. 155, v. 165, vv. 171-173, vv. 202-203.

2. Mv., chap. V, v. 33.

3. Mv., chap. VI, v. 38.

4. Mv., chap. IX, v. 12, v. 29. Paṇḍuvāsudeva also appears to be a legendary figure (U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 98-111).

5. Mv., chap. XIV, v. 56.

wished to secure the throne for her own son conspired to kill the uparāja, who was evidently the heir-apparent.[1] After the reign of Devānampiya Tissa there seems to be no reference to the term uparāja in the Mahāvaṁsa.

An inscription at Kusalānakanda in the Batticaloa District gives the following genealogy: 'Uparaja Naga, his son raja Abhaya, his son Gamaṇi Tisa'.[2] This uparaja Naga has been identified with the uparāja Mahānāga, the younger brother of Devānampiya Tissa, who set himself up as ruler of Rohaṇa.[3] The uparaja Naga of the rock inscription at Moṭṭayakallu has also been identified with uparāja Mahānāga of the chronicle.[4] Uvaraja Naka or Naga figures in two first-century rock inscriptions, one at Tissamahārāma and the other near that place at Kirinda.[5] The

---

1. Mv., chap. XXII, v. 3.

2. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, p. 30, no. 389; J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, V (1958), p. 145 ff.

3. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, p. lvi.

4. Ibid., p. 37, no. 489; A.S.C.A.R., 1950, p. 28.

5. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXXVI, no. 98 (1945), pp. 61-65.

uvaraja[1] Naka of these records has been identified with Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga, the younger brother of Bhātikābhaya, who ascended the throne after Bhātikābhaya.[2] The Häbässa Inscription in the Buttala Korale of the Ūva Province records the grant of certain fields to a monastery at the place by uvaraja Naka, son of Utara.[3] Paranavitana has pointed out the possibility of identifying this uvaraja Naka with Mahallaka Nāga who succeeded Gajabāhu to the throne.[4]

Two facts emerge from the references given above: first, that the title of uparāja was bestowed on the heir-apparent, and second, that the uparāja was entrusted with the administration of Rohaṇa - the apanage of the crown-prince during the early Anurādhapura period. This is suggested by the fact that the title is not met with in the early epigraphic records outside the principality

---

1. It is not clear whether the term uvaraja corresponds to uparāja or to yuvarāja. However, it is noteworthy that only the term uparāja occurs in the Mahāvaṁsa and the same term is met with in most of the inscriptions of the early period. Therefore, it is likely that uvaraja is the Sinhalese equivalent of the Pāli uparāja.

2. Mv., chap. XXXIV, v. 68.

3. E.Z., vol. IV, pp. 214-216.

4. Ibid.; Mv., chap. XXXV, v. 123.

of Rohaṇa. Hence it can be concluded that the title uparāja was a particular designation given to the heir-apparent of the early Anurādhapura period who was in charge of Rohaṇa.

The term uparāja occurs for the first time in the Cūḷavaṁsa in the sixth century A.D. Mahānāga (569-571) made the son of his mother's brother, Aggabodhi, uparāja[1] and the latter appears to have ascended the throne after Mahānāga.[2] It is said that Aggabodhi I (571-604) conferred the dignity of uparāja on his mother's brother and that of yuvarāja on his younger brother.[3] From this it becomes clear that in the later Anurādhapura period when the title of yuvarāja came into use, there was a clear distinction between the position of yuvarāja and that of the uparāja.[4] When Aggabodhi III (629-639)

---

1. Cv., chap. 41, v. 93.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 1. See Cūḷavaṁsa, edited by Sumangala and Batuvantudawe. Geiger has given a different rendering

3. Mātulaṁ uparājavhe, bhātaraṁ yuvarājake bhāgineyyaṁ ca Malayarājaṭṭhāne ṭhapesi so (Cv., chap. 42, v. 6).

4. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 121.

became king, he invested his younger brother Māna with the dignity of uparāja and granted him the province of Dakkhiṇadesa.[1] After the premature death of uparāja Māna,[2] Aggabodhi III consecrated his youngest brother Kassapa as uparāja who later became his successor.[3] It is said that after Aggabodhi IV's death, an usurper seized the uparāja Dāṭhāsiva and had him thrown into prison.[4] Apparently the uparāja Dāṭhāsiva was also the legitimate heir to the throne, the yuvarāja. Mahinda I (730-733) conferred the dignity of uparāja on Aggabodhi, the son of his brother Kassapa, and assigned him Pācīnadesa.[5] Eventually the uparāja Aggabodhi ascended the throne at Anurādhapura.[6] Aggabodhi VI (733-772) consecrated the son of Mahinda, who was likewise called

---

1. Kaniṭṭhaṁ bhātaraṁ Mānaṁ oparajje'bhisiñciya (Cv., chap. 44, v. 84).
2. Cv., chap. 44, v. 123.
3. Cv., chap. 44, v. 124, vv. 144-145.
4. Cv., chap. 46, vv. 39-40.
5. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 32-33.
6. Cv., chap. 48, v. 42.

Aggabodhi, as uparāja[1] and he, too, succeeded him to the throne.[2] Aggabodhi VII (772-777) appointed his own son Mahinda to the position of uparāja;[3] the latter did not, however, ascend the throne owing to his premature death.[4] The next king, who likewise bore the name Mahinda, granted the dignity of uparāja to his own son;[5] and after his son's premature death, conferred the same dignity on yet another son[6] who in the sequel became his successor.[7] Sena II (853-887) is said to have made his younger brother, Mahinda, uparāja and granted him Dakkhiṇadesa.[8] The uparāja Mahinda died before he became king.[9] The uparāja

---

1. Oparajje kumāraṁ ca abhisiñcittha bhūpati (Cv., chap. 48, v. 42).

2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 68.

3. Oparajje'bhisiñcittha Mahindaṁ puttam attano (Cv., chap. 48, v. 69).

4. Cv., chap. 48, v. 75.

5. puttassa tassa pādāsi oparajjaṁ sabhogiyaṁ (Cv., chap. 48, v. 115).

6. Cv., chap. 48, v. 158. A son of Mahinda by a former marriage (Cv., chap. 48, v. 149).

7. Cv., chap. 49, v. 1.

8. Cv., chap. 51, v. 7.

9. Cv., chap. 51, v. 62.

of Dappula III (923-924) was a prince of the same name,[1] who was also his successor.[2] During Udaya III's (935-938) reign ādipāda Sena held the dignity of uparāja, and he later ascended the throne as the successor of Udaya.[3]

It is evident from the references given above that the title of uparāja was confined to close relatives of the king who were, in all probability, regarded as successors to the throne. This inference receives some measure of support from the fact that almost all the princes who were bestowed with the title of uparāja ascended the throne unless they suffered a premature death. Thus Aggabodhi I (571-604),[4] Kassapa II (650-659),[5] Aggabodhi VI (733-772),[6] Aggabodhi VII (772-777),[7]

---

1. Cv., chap. 53, v. 1.
2. Cv., chap. 53, v. 4.
3. Cv., chap. 53, v. 13, v. 28.
4. Cv. (Sumangala and Batuvantudawe edition), chap. 42, v. 1.
5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 124, vv. 144-145.
6. Cv., chap. 48, v. 42.
7. Cv., chap. 48, v. 42, v. 68.

Udaya I (797-801),[1] Dappula IV (924-935),[2] Sena III (938-946)[3] and Sena IV (954-956)[4] - all uparājas - ascended the throne of Anurādhapura. Another important point to be noted here is the bestowal of the territory reserved for the heir-apparent, i.e., Dakkhiṇadesa, on the uparāja.[5] Further, the fact that the title of uparāja was used side by side with the title yuvarāja to denote the heir-apparent can be cited in favour of the above inference. It is said that Aggabodhi III (629-639) consecrated his younger brother Māna uparāja;[6] he was afterwards referred to as yuvarāja.[7] After Māna's premature death his next youngest brother Kassapa was appointed uparāja[8] and he, too, was described later as

---

1. Cv., chap. 49, v. 1.
2. Cv., chap. 53, v. 4.
3. Cv., chap. 53, v. 13, v. 28.
4. Cv., chap. 53, v. 39; chap. 54, v. 1.
5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 84; chap. 51, v. 7; chap. 51, v. 12.
6. Kanitthaṁ bhātaraṁ Mānaṁ oparajje'bhisiñciya (Cv., chap. 44, v. 84).
7. Amaccā tassa māresuṁ Mānavhaṁ yuvarājakaṁ (Cv., chap. 44, v. 123).
8. Tato Kassapanāmaṁ so kanitthaṁ sakabhātaraṁ pālento saṁtatiṁ rājā oparajje'bhisecayi (Cv., chap. 44, v. 124).

yuvarāja.[1] In the same way Mahinda was the uparāja of Aggabodhi VII (772-777) and was called in the sequel yuvarāja.[2] The same was the case with an unnamed son of Mahinda II (777-797).[3] It is said in the Cūḷavaṁsa that Kassapa, son of Sena II (853-887), was consecrated uparāja on the day of his name-giving itself,[4] but in the inscriptions of Kassapa the term uparāja is replaced by the title yuvarāja: 'received at the very instant of his birth the auspicious unction of yuvarāja'.[5]

In view of these instances the appointment of another individual than the yuvarāja to be uparāja appears to be a rare exception due to very special circumstances. The only recorded instance is that Aggabodhi I

---

1. Kassapo yuvarājā so senaṁ rakkhitum attano (Cv., chap. 44, v. 137). Cf. also v. 144.

2. Oparajje'bhisiñcittha Mahindaṁ puttam attano (Cv., chap. 48, v. 69); Tato pubbe va tass'āsi putto so yuvarājako (Cv., chap. 48, v. 75).

3. Cv., chap. 48, v. 115, v. 149.

4. nāmadānadine yeva parihārena sabbaso oparajje'bhisiñcitvā Dakkhiṇaṁ desam ass'adā (Cv., chap. 51, v. 12).

5. . . . räjnäṇiyan kushi hevä dunu-säṇähi me yuva-raj bisev siri pämänä (E.Z., vol. I, p. 46).

appointed his mother's brother uparāja and conferred the dignity of yuvarāja on his younger brother.[1] It is possible that there were also two different persons in the reign of Mahinda I holding these two titles. It is said that Mahinda I conferred the dignity of uparāja on his brother's son Aggabodhi, and assigned him Pācīna-desa 'the Eastern Province'. But the province of Dakkhiṇa-desa, the king gave to his own son.[2] As Dakkhiṇadesa was the apanage of the heir-apparent, it is possible that Mahinda appointed his son as yuvarāja.[3] But these two instances seem to be exceptions rather than the rule. Normally the yuvarāja was invested with the dignity of uparāja.[4]

Another important point to be noted here is that the princes who are referred to in the chronicle as the yuvarāja or uparāja in a particular reign, figure under the title of mahapā or its variants in inscriptions of

---

1. Cv., chap. 42, v. 6.

2. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 32-33.

3. Cv., p. 113, n. 3.

4. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 121.

that reign. Thus Udaya II (887-898) who is called yuvarāja in the Cūḷavaṁsa[1] assumes the title of mahayā in his Nāgama Pillar Inscription.[2] Similarly, Kassapa V (914-923) who is known by the titles of uparāja and yuvarāja in the chronicle[3] figures under the title of mahayā in a number of his inscriptions.[4] According to the Cūḷavaṁsa, Dappula III appears to have held the rank of yuvarāja in the reign of Kassapa V.[5] A pillar inscription from Dorabawila refers to the same yuvarāja as mahapā.[6] Dappula IV, uparāja of Dappula III (923-924),[7] figures under the title of mahayā in his Vessagiriya Slab Inscription[8] and also in the Koṇḍavaṭṭavan Pillar Inscription.[9]

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, v. 63.
2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 14.
3. Cv., chap. 51, v. 12; chap. 52, v. 37.
4. E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 351, p. 355, p. 365.
5. Cv., chap. 52, v. 42. Dappula IV in earlier lists.
6. E.Z., vol. V, p. 289 (Decree of mahapā Dāpul, No. 1).
7. Cv., chap. 53, v. 1.
8. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25. Dappula IV is referred to as Dappula V in earlier lists.
9. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 137.

Similarly, yuvarāja Udaya III (935-938) of the chronicle[1] assumes the title of mahayā in his epigraphic records. The Puliyankulam Slab Inscription, the Dorabawila Pillar Inscription and the Aturupolayagama Pillar Inscription can be cited as examples.[2] It is said in the Cūlavaṁsa that Sena IV (954-956) bestowed the dignity of yuvarāja on ādipāda Mahinda,[3] who later ascended the throne as Mahinda IV. In the inscriptions of Mahinda IV the term mahapā is used in place of the title yuvarāja.[4] It is apparent from the evidence given above that not only the dignity of uparāja but also that of mahapā was conferred on the heir-apparent during this period.

The data available in the sources are inadequate to arrive at a conclusion regarding the correlation of these three titles. However, on the strength of the

---

1. Cv., chap. 53, v. 4, v. 13.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 186; E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 299 (Decree of mahapā Udā, No. 2); E.Z., vol. V, pt. III, p. 384.

3. Cv., chap. 54, v. 1.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, p. 221, p. 234.

evidence given above it can be concluded that yuvarāja was the official designation given to the heir-apparent during the period under survey. With the growth of power the rulers of our period seem to have introduced a more formal and official title for their intended successors. The dignity of uparāja, on the other hand, appears to be a position of trust carrying with its certain rights, apparently participation in the business of government.[1] We have at least one instance to cite in favour of this supposition. It is said in the Cūḷavaṁsa that during the reign of Aggabodhi VI (733-772) his uparāja, also called Aggabodhi, administered the government himself.[2] The title of uparāja may have signified the highest position of state next to the king. It appears that in ancient times in India, too, the title carried such significance. It is said in the Aṅguttara Nikāya that 'the eldest son of a king, if he is endowed with five necessary qualifications makes viceroyalty his aim'.[3]

---

1. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 121.

2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 43.

3. Aṅguttara Nikāya, III, p. 154.

The three stages of a king are described as 'princehood, viceroyalty and kingship'.[1] It should also be noted here that the heir-apparent alone was invested with this dignity.[2] Therefore, the title yuvarāja, as well as uparāja seems to have been used as a general term to denote the crown-prince of the period under survey.

The title of mahapā also appears to be a designation given to the heir-apparent of our period. As seen above, the foremost among the äpās or in other words, the one who is intended by the reigning monarch to be his successor was given the title of maha-äpā or mahayā. Thus, it appears that during the period under consideration all these titles were closely allied with one another, and that they were bestowed exclusively on the close members of the royal family.

The members of the royal family were also appointed to the position of malayarāja. The title malayarāja, so

---

1. kumāra kīḷikaṁ kiḷi, oparajjaṁ kāresi, rajjaṁ kāresi (Dīgha Nikāya, II, p. 196; Majjhima Nikāya, II, p. 76). The term uparāja occurs frequently in the Jātakas, but no evidence is available in the Jātaka stories regarding the duties and functions connected with the office of a viceroy.

2. There is only one instance when this rule was not adhered to during the period under survey.

frequent later, is mentioned for the first time in the reign of Silākāla (518-531). It is said that Silākāla conferred this title on his second son Dāṭhāpabhuti.[1] Aggabodhi I (571-604) made his sister's son malayarāja,[2] and Kassapa V (914-923) his son Siddhattha, born of a queen other than the mahesi.[3] At the time of Aggabodhi IV (667-683) a malayarāja Bodhitissa is mentioned[4] but no evidence is available to determine how he was related to the royal family. Moggallāna III (614-619) conferred the dignity of malayarāja on the senāpati of his predecessor Saṁghatissa.[5] As the position of senāpati was almost always confined to the members of the royal family, it is possible that the senāpati-malayarāja mentioned above was a relative of the king.

Malaya is the name of the central mountain region

---

1. Cv., chap. 41, v. 35.
2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 6.
3. Cv., chap. 52, v. 68.
4. Cv., chap. 46, vv. 29-30.
5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 43.

of the Island,[1] and therefore it can be inferred that malayarāja was entrusted with the administration of this province. But it cannot be said with certainty if this was the established custom. There is at least one instance when the malayarāja was entrusted with the province of Dakkhiṇadesa.[2] If the designation of malayarāja was not a mere honorary title - a possibility which may not be completely ruled out - one might infer from this title that he was normally in charge of Malayadeśa.

The designations of chatta-gāhaka 'umbrella-bearer' and asiggāhaka 'sword-bearer' were also bestowed on the members of the royal family. The first mention of a chatta-gāhaka is with reference to the events which followed the death of Mahānāma (406-428). On his death Sotthisena, the son of Mahānāma by a consort of Tamil race, ascended the throne but was murdered at the instigation of Saṁghā, Mahānāma's daughter by his anointed queen. She ceded the sovereignty to her husband, who held the office of

---

1. The mountainous country in the centre of the Island between Rājaraṭṭha and the provinces depending thereon in the North and Dakkhiṇadesa and Rohaṇa in the South.

2. Thānaṁ Malayarājaggaṁ desaṁ datva va Dakkhiṇaṁ (Cv., chap. 41, v. 35).

chatta-gāhaka, and he occupied the throne for one year.[1] The office is not met with again until after the end of the Anurādhapura kingdom. Moggallāna I (491-508) is said to have bestowed the office of sword-bearer (asiggāhaka) on Silākāla who later became king and ruled for thirteen years.[2] Aggabodhi II (604-614) appointed a relative of his queen to this position who also became his successor.[3] Moggallāna III (614-619) said to have given the office of asiggāhaka to the son of the senāpati of his predecessor Saṁghatissa and later he became powerful enough to capture the throne for himself.[4] The importance of the designations of chatta-gāhaka and asiggāhaka is evident from the fact that only the close relatives of the king were appointed to these positions and that almost all those who held these offices ended their career as sovereign rulers of the Island.

The office of the commander of the armed forces continued to be one of the highest importance, as it had

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 1-3.
2. Cv., chap. 39, v. 55.
3. Cv., chap. 42, v. 42; chap. 43, v. 1.
4. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 43, 53-64.

been in early days, and was often held by a close relative of the king. It is said that Dhātusena (455-473) bestowed the office of senāpati on his sister's son and gave him his daughter in marriage.[1] Aggabodhi VI (733-772) conferred the office of senāpati on his son, Mahinda, who later ascended the throne.[2] Mahinda II (777-797) also appointed his own son as the commander-in-chief.[3] Sena Ilaṅga, the senāpati of Kassapa IV (898-914), is also said to have been a scion of the royal family.[4] The chronicle mentions several other senāpatis without indicating the relationship, if any, that they had to the king.[5] As the security of the king's position depended to a great extent on the fidelity of this officer, it is possible that the person appointed to the post was very often a close relative of the king himself.

The position of the senāpati as the head of the army gave him considerable amount of power and influence

---

1. Bhāgineyyassa pādāsi senāpaccaṁ ca taṁ ca so (Cv., chap. 38, v. 81).

2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 78; see also p. 117, n. 6.

3. Cv., chap. 48, v. 154.

4. Tassa senāpatī Seno Ilaṅgo rājavaṁsajo (Cv., chap. 52, v. 16).

5. Cv., chap. 39, v. 6, v. 58; chap. 49, v. 80; chap. 50, v. 82; chap. 51, v. 88; chap. 53, v. 11; chap. 54, v. 13, v. 58.

which he could use to his own advantage to the extent of overthrowing the reigning monarch. The senāpati of Dhātusena was instrumental in imprisoning the king and placing on the throne Kassapa who probably had no claim to it.[1] Silākāla, the senāpati of Upatissa,[2] defeated the latter in battle and became king himself.[3] The senāpati of Saṁghatissa (614) waged war against him and helped Moggallāna to seize the throne.[4] Several other instances are also recorded when senāpatis succeeded in becoming kings,[5] and all these reveal the power and influence that was attached to this office.

It is evident from the discussion above that almost all the highest ranks of state were conferred on

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 80-111.

2. Geiger's translation seems to be incorrect. Geiger has taken Upatissa to be the husband of Moggallāna's sister. But according to the account given in the Cūḷavaṁsa (chap. 39, v. 55), the sister of Moggallāna was given in marriage to Silākāla. Therefore the phrase Moggallānassa bhaginisāmiko dhajinīpati (chap. 41, v. 6) qualifies Silākāla not Upatissa. See Cūḷavaṁsa, ed. Sumangala and Batuvantudawe, p. 18.

3. Cv., chap. 41, vv. 6-26.

4. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 8-20.

5. The first recorded attempt of a senāpati to gain power was that of Kammahārattaka in the reign of Khallāṭanāga (Mv., chap. XXXIII, v. 33). Kuñcanāga's senāpati who was the brother of his queen rebelled against the king and became king himself (Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 21).

members of the royal family. The appointing of royal members - king's relatives - to these positions may have been helpful in strengthening the power of the king. But, on the other hand, the power wielded by them as high dignitaries of state remained a formidable check on the exercise of royal power. The king, in arriving at important decisions on political and administrative matters, was assisted by a council of high dignitaries. The constitution and the functions of the Council (sabhā) are not known[1] but a comparison with the later traditions reveals that all the royal members who held high positions of state were included in it. When Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110) made an order granting privileges of an extraordinary nature to the family of Lord Budal, to whom the king owed his life and throne, he was enthroned in the palace at Anurādhapura, in the royal council which included the äpā and māpā, who were his brothers, and the yuvarāja.[2] However, there is no evidence to suggest that the king was bound to abide by the counsel

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 372.

2. E.Z., vol. V, pp. 21 and 24.

of his high dignitaries, but if such counsel was unanimous, no ruler who desired the maintenance of his power and authority would have disregarded their opinion.[1] Therefore, the power and influence of these high dignitaries may have somewhat limited the otherwise almost absolute authority of the king.

---

1. Lak Raja Lo Sirita, see appendix III.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROYAL CONSECRATION

The Śānti Parvan of the Mahābhārata regards the abhiṣeka of a king as the most important ceremony for any society.[1] The word abhiṣeka literally means 'sprinkling' (abhi+sic) and as the sprinkling with sacred water of the Ganges formed the chief feature of the ancient ceremony of the royal inauguration, the ceremony itself was called abhiṣeka.[2]

According to Indian belief, it was absolutely necessary to perform the abhiṣeka ceremony before a prince was acknowledged as a sovereign.[3] It is therefore not surprising that this ceremony seems to have existed in

---

1. Mbh., S.P., XII, 67. 2.

2. C. M. Fernando, 'The Inauguration of the King in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XIV, no. 47, p. 125. According to Vaddhaki Sūkara Jātaka, the ceremony was first originated among the animals (Jātaka no. 283 in The Jātaka, vol. II, ed. E. B. Cowell, trans. W. H. D. Rouse, p. 278).

3. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S.(1936), p. 451.

India from very early times. The word abhiṣeka, without any precise ceremonial implications, occurs several times in the Atharva Veda,[1] but not in the Rig or Sāma Veda. In the White Yajur Veda, and in the three Saṁhitās of the Black Yajur Veda, as well as in several Brāhmaṇas[2] and the Śrauta ritual of all the four Vedas, abhiṣeka is mentioned as the name of a rite included in the Rājasūya. The last book of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[3] has the abhiṣeka itself as its main topic. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa two special forms of abhiṣeka are mentioned, namely, Punarabhiṣeka[4] and Aindramahābhiṣeka.[5] The former, which takes place after a sacrifice, has apparently no relation to the installation of a/new sovereign and refers probably to the Rājasūya.[6] The Aindramahābhiṣeka is so named because

---

1. Atharva Veda, III, v. 3; VI, vv. 87-88.

2. TB., 1, 8, 7, 2; ŚB., 5, 4, 2, 1-6; MS., 2, 6, 11; TS., 1, 8, 14; KS., 15, 7; VS., 10, 17-19.

3. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, chap. 38. For the abhiṣeka in general, see Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 1, s.v. abhiṣeka, by F. W. Thomas; also cf. J. C. Heesterman, The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration.

4. AB., VIII, 5-11.

5. Ibid., 12-20.

6. The name punarabhiṣeka implies that the person concern/ed was an already crowned king, and the object of the rite was probably to reinforce his vigour as such.

it follows the rites whereby Indra was consecrated king of the gods.

The earliest authentic description of the abhiṣeka ceremony in Ceylon, occurs in the Pāli commentary to the Mahāvaṁsa, known as the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. This is based on the commentary to the Cūḷasīhanāda Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya in the Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā (the old Sinhalese commentary of the Pāli canon). According to this work, the abhiṣeka or the inauguration ceremony with its great pomp and revelry was introduced to the Island from India in the time of Devānampiya Tissa.[1] 'It should be known that in this Island a Khattiya maiden sent by Dhammāśoka poured the lustral water on the head of Devānampiya Tissa. . . .Previous to this no such ceremony was known in Laṅkā.'[2] The ancient kings, says the Tīkā, 'only reigned with a new sceptre' (kevalaṁ nava-yaṭṭhiyā rajjaṁ kāresuṁ),[3] and it is possible that Devānampiya Tissa was also first consecrated in this

---

1. Vpk.(P.T.S.), vol. 1, p. 306; S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon,' J.R.A.S.(1936), p. 451.

2. Vpk., vol. 1, p. 306.

3. Ibid.

manner,[1] but his second consecration took place according to the more orthodox rite. Since that time the rulers of Ceylon seem to have adhered to this ceremony. The inscriptions of our period, in referring to kings and queens, never omit the fact of their consecration.[2] But the exact details of the ritual conducted in the course of these inauguration ceremonies cannot now be determined. However, there is little doubt that much of the Indian ritual was repeated in Ceylon, and customs and traditions were established after the first consecration that was carried out under the instruction of the Emperor Aśoka. From a comparative study of the coronation ceremonies in various societies, Hocart concluded that the parent rite of all coronations may be summarized as follows: preparation, admonition and promise, clothing, communion, unction, investing with regalia, and procession.[3] It is remarkable that most of these rites can be detected in the description of the abhiṣeka ceremony given in the

---

1. See T. Hettiarachchy, History of Kingship in Ceylon, PP. 40-42,; S. Paranavitana, op. cit., pp. 452-453; H. Ellawala, Social History of Early Ceylon, pp. 22-27.

2. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 225-237; E.Z., vol. III, p. 300; E.Z., vol. II, p. 67.

3. A. M. Hocart, Kingship, p. 81.

Vaṁsatthappakāsinī.

As the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī is supposed to have been written in the latter part of the Anurādhapura period, it is of importance to examine the account given there in order to form an idea of the abhiṣeka ceremony prevailing in the period under consideration.[1] The commentator, after explaining verses 25-33 of chapter eleven of the chronicle, which gives a list of the 'necessaries' sent by Aśoka for the consecration of Devānampiya Tissa, includes an interesting account of the abhiṣeka ceremony. The description given by the commentator appears, however, to be somewhat complicated as it is not clear whether this account refers directly to the abhiṣeka ceremony of Devānampiya Tissa or whether it is a general description of the abhiṣeka ceremony in Ceylon. The dual character of this account has not received the attention of many scholars. It is generally believed that the commentator dealt solely with the abhiṣeka of Devānampiya Tissa.[2] Their view, however, becomes less likely when we take into account the exact nature of the

---

1. See appendix I; C. M. Fernando, op. cit., p. 126; H. Ellawala, op. cit., pp. 22-23; W. Geiger, C.C.M.T., pp. 116-117.

2. H. Ellawala, op. cit., p. 22.

description given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. In the first place, this account of the abhiseka is given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī as an extract taken from the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā(Sinhalese commentary). The commentator himself says that the details regarding the abhiseka ceremony given in his work are taken from the commentary to the Cūḷasīhanāda Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya in the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā.[1] Then he proceeds to give a general description of the ceremony as is evidenced by the following passage:

> Ten'eva Majjhimasaṁgitiyā Cūḷasīhanāda suttavaṇṇanāya Sīhalaṭṭhakathāya vuttaṁ. Kathaṁ? Paṭhamaṁ tāva abhisekaṁ gaṇhantānaṁ rājūnaṁ suvaṇṇamayādīni tīṇi saṅkhāni ca Gangodakañ ca Khattiyakaññañ ca laddhuṁ vaṭṭatī[2]ti vatvā rājūnaṁ abhiseka-karaṇavidhiñ ca vuttaṁ.
>
> 'Therefore it is said in the Sinhalese commentary of that portion of the Majjhima Nikāya known as Cūḷasīhanāda Suttavaṇṇanā. How was it said? In the first place he who wishes to be duly inaugurated as king should obtain for this purpose three chanks, water from the Ganges river, and a maiden of the Kṣatriya race. Then it illustrates the manner in which the abhiseka was performed.'

The closing sentence of this account is as follows:

. . . . ti evaṁ rañño abhisapanti viya daṭṭhabbā.[3] 'Thus it should be known that the abhiseka ceremony of kings was performed in this manner.' The above extracts would make

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, p. 305.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 306.

it clear that the first part of the account of the abhiṣeka in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, has been given as a general description of the ceremony. There is no reference whatsoever to the abhiṣeka of Devānampiya Tissa in particular in this part of the account. It occurs only in the second part of the description where there is a detailed account of the abhiṣeka of Devānampiya Tissa.[1]

The account given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī as an explanation of the verses mentioned above can thus be divided into two parts: the first, a description of the abhiṣeka ceremony in general;[2] the second, dealing with the abhiṣeka of Devānampiya Tissa in particular. If this inference is correct, to what extent can it be regarded as a description of the abhiṣeka ceremony that prevailed in medieval times? In this connexion Geiger writes: 'Since the work was certainly composed before the middle of the thirteenth century its author could have a knowledge of the abhiṣeka, as it was performed in the medieval era, and of the traditions connected with it.'[3] It may now be proper to examine whether the commentator actually refers to the conditions of his own time.

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, p. 306; S. Paranavitana, op. cit., pp. 449-451; H. Ellawala, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

2. See appendix I.

3. W. Geiger, Dīpavaṁsa and Mahāvaṁsa, p. 37; C.C.M.T., p. 116.

The date of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī has been extensively discussed by both Geiger and Malalasekera. Geiger attributes this work to a period between 1000 and 1250 A.D.[1] but Malalasekera has given more plausible evidence in favour of dating this work back to the eighth or ninth century A.D.[2] Although there seems to be some controversy over the precise date of this work, it is generally believed that it was composed before the tenth century A.D. The Vaṁsatthappakāsinī thus appears to be a work written in the latter part of the Anurādhapura period. But, it is worthwhile to note here that the account of the abhiṣeka given in this commentary does not deal with the ceremony prevailing in the time in which the author lived. Two arguments may be adduced for this view. Firstly, it may be said that the account in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī is based on a work written in the pre-Christian centuries(Sīhalaṭṭhakathā).[3] Secondly, it may be contended that as the author of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī has kept much material contained in the original version of the

---

1. Geiger, Introduction to Mahāvaṁsa, p. VIII.
2. Malalasekera, Introduction to Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, p. CIX.
3. See pp. 145-146 below.

pre-Christian centuries, i.e., the Sīhalatthakathā, it does not reflect the conditions prevailing in medieval times. It is explicitly said in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī that the details regarding the abhiṣeka ceremony given there are taken from the commentary to the Cūḷasīhanāda Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya in the Sīhalatthakathā (the old Sinhalese commentary of the Pāli canon). The compilation of these Sinhalese commentaries or Sīhalatthakathā has been ascribed to thera Mahinda,[1] the great Buddhist missionary who arrived in the Island at the time of Devānampiya Tissa,[2] i.e., in the third century B.C. The attribution of the Sinhalese commentaries to thera Mahinda is further strengthened by a passage in the Cūḷavaṁsa:

> The text alone has been handed down here (in Jambudvīpa), there is no commentary here. Neither have we the deviating systems of the teachers. The commentary in the Sīhala tongue is faultless. The wise Mahinda, who tested the tradition laid before the three councils as it was preached by the Perfectly Enlightened One and taught by Sāriputta and the others, wrote it in the Sīhala tongue.[3]

But it seems rather unlikely that thera Mahinda alone was responsible for the compilation of all the Sinhalese

---

1. M. B. Ariyapala, Society in Medieval Ceylon, p. 14; Cv., chap. 37, vv. 227-230.

2. Mv., chap. XIII,

3. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 227-230.

commentaries. After thera Mahinda, his followers would have continued the task of compiling the commentaries in Sīhala language. However, the final arrangement of these works seems to have taken place in the first century B.C.[1] Hence the compilation of the whole series of Sinhalese commentaries should be ascribed to the period from the third to the first century B.C. As the account given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī has been quoted from one of the Sinhalese commentaries, it is evident that the account refers to the abhiṣeka ceremony existing in the Island at the time when the Sinhalese commentaries were compiled. Therefore, it may be reasonable to infer that the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī describes the abhiṣeka ceremony as it prevailed in the Island during the last pre-Christian centuries.

Before examining whether the abhiṣeka ceremony as described in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī was observed in the period under survey, it is worthwhile to call

---

1. 'With regard to the Sinhalese commentaries, said to have been compiled by Mahinda, their very nature precludes the possibility of having been handed down orally. It may be that in Vaṭṭagāmiṇi's time they were still unarranged, rare, imperfect and full of inaccuracies, as even now in manuscripts. At Alu-Vihāra the text was rehearsed and commentaries revised and distributed.' (G. P. Malalasekera, Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 45).

attention to the similarity of the abhiṣeka ceremony in ancient Ceylon with that of India. In this respect we should first elucidate the difference between the Rājasūya sacrifice and the abhiṣeka ceremony, as some scholars are inclined to think that these two ceremonies are identical.[1] As has been pointed out by Heesterman, Rājasūya is not a royal consecration in the sense of a ceremony performed once and for all in order to bestow royal power on a king. 'Its character can best be understood when compared with the yearly festivals known in Hinduism as Utsava - the Rājasūya is also a sava - by means of which the powers active in the universe are regenerated.'[2] It is explicitly stated that Rājasūya is to be performed by a king who wants to obtain access to heaven(svargakāma).[3] Abhiṣeka, on the other hand, is a ceremony performed once and for all by virtue of which kingship is conferred on a person.[4] The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa[5] gives the details of the abhiṣeka as an

---

1. H. Ellawala, op. cit., p. 21; T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., p. 48.

2. J. C. Heesterman, The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration, p. 222, see also p. 7.

3. Cf. Ap., 18, 8, 1; Hir., 13, 3, 1.

4. Heesterman, op. cit., p. 7.

5. T.B., II. 7, 15-17.

independent performance in three sections which are separate from those devoted to the Rājasūya. Goldstücker observes that 'the rites of the abhiṣeka which is not part of a Rājasūya sacrifice, but a ceremony performed at a king's accession to the throne, are similar to, but not identical with, those of the Punarabhiṣeka; they are founded on the proceedings which took place when Indra was consecrated by the gods as their supreme ruler'.[1] The abhiṣeka appears therefore to have been an independent ceremony existing side by side with the Rājasūya.[2] Hence, the rites of the Rājasūya sacrifice should not be taken as rituals observed at the abhiṣeka of a king.[3] The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa contains a description of the abhiṣeka ceremony as performed in Vedic times. But the description of the abhiṣeka ceremony given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī seems to be similar to the ceremony described in the Epic and Puranic texts.[4]

---

1. T. Goldstücker, English - Sanskrit Vocabulary, p. 277.

2. N. N. Law, Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, p. 194.

3. T. Goldstücker, op. cit., p. 277; J. C. Heesterman, op. cit., p. 222; N. N. Law, op. cit., pp. 193-194.

4. From the description given in the Epic poems it becomes clear that the Veda ceremony had undergone various modifications at the time of their composition. Of the

The type of inauguration ceremony as practised according to Epics may probably be recognised in the history of the inauguration of Rāma as found in the Rāmāyaṇa,[1] and in that of the inauguration of Yudhiṣṭhira as found in the Mahābhārata.[2] Among the inauguration

---

ceremony itself it is said in the Yuddhakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa that it was performed in the fashion of Indra's inauguration, but a first difference which, to judge from the scanty detail of the text, appears to exist between the manner in which the ceremony was conducted at the Epic and that in which it was conducted at the Vedic period, is that the wife of Rāma shares in some of the ceremonies and also takes a seat on the throne with the husband (similarly, in Ceylon the wife of the king took part in the ceremony), while a participation of the wife of the king in the ceremony is not mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. And, a second and still more important difference results from the circumstance that not merely Vaśiṣṭha, the officiating priest, sprinkled Rāma with the consecrated liquid, but after him a number of other eminent Brāhmaṇas; moreover, after them, in succession, the assistant priest, the damsels, the military chiefs and the citizens, and also the gods shedding over him from the sky the essence of all plants. Although the Vasus and other gods sprinkled Indra with the liquid to inaugurate him as king, no mention is made in the Veda ceremony as applied to a mortal king, that anyone else but the officiating priest inaugurated the king by anointing him with the sacred liquid.

The inauguration ceremony described in the Purāṇas has but little affinity with the Veda ceremony. According to the description given in the Agni Purāṇa (chapter 209) four ministers sprinkled the king who is seated on the throne; first the Brāhmaṇa minister with clarified butter out of a golden jar, then the Kṣatriya minister with milk out of a silver jar, next the Vaiśya minister with curd out of a copper jar and lastly the Śūdra minister with water out of a earthen jar (Goldstücker, op. cit., pp. 280-282).

1. Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddha kāṇḍa.

2. Mbh., Sabhā Parva, cc. 33, 45; Śānti Parva, c. 40.

implements are mentioned a beautiful golden throne covered with a tiger skin, water taken from the confluence of the Ganges and Jumna, golden jars filled with shoots of the udumbara tree, water and other propitious objects taken from places of pilgrimage, a white sceptre, a fan, a white parasol, eight beautiful damsels in fine attire etc.[1] In the list given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī there are references to similar objects - a coronation chair made of udumbara wood, a fan, a turban, a sword, a parasol, water from the Ganges, a maiden in the flower of her youth, utensils such as golden platters, vessels made of clay taken from places of pilgrimage etc.[2] A more significant similarity appears in the description given in the Epics and Vaṁsatthappakāsinī about the manner in which the ceremony was conducted. According to the Rāmāyaṇa not merely Vaśiṣṭha, the officiating priest, sprinkled Rāma with the consecrated liquid but also after him a number of other eminent Brāhmaṇas, the damsels, the military chiefs and the citizens.[3] Moreover, it is said in the Agni Purāṇa that four ministers, each representing

---

1. Rāmāyaṇa, ed. Gorresier, 2.15. In another edition the throne seat is defined as 'made of udumbara wood,' see Schlegel's edition, 2.14, v. 32 ff.

2. Vpk., vol. 1, pp. 304, 307.

3. Rāmāyaṇa, 2.15.

the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra castes, sprinkled the king with the consecrated liquid.[1] Similarly, three representatives of the Kṣatriya, Brāhmaṇa and the Vaiśya castes took part in the consecration described in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī.[2]

If it is believed that the abhiṣeka ceremony with its pomp and revelry was introduced to the Island from India, one could expect some similarity in the rites performed in both countries. Fa-hsien who visited the Island in the fifth century A.D., testifies to this when he says that kings of Ceylon did their purification ceremonies according to Hindu customs.[3] Thus the abhiṣeka ceremony of ancient Ceylon appears to have been modelled after the Indian ceremony. But this does not necessarily imply that the ceremony had no indigenous character at all.[4]

Under the influence of Buddhism the ceremony seems to have undergone certain changes. It is to be noted here that the introduction of the abhiṣeka ceremony into Ceylon was contemporaneous with the advent of Buddhist

---

1. Agni Purāṇa, chapter 209.
2. Vpk., vol. I, p. 305.
3. S. Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, LXXIV.
4. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 117.

missionaries from India.[1] The Buddhist colouring given to this essentially Hindu ceremony is apparent in the description given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. The Vaṁsatthappakāsinī states that the water was poured on the king three times by three different persons. First a Kṣatriya maiden poured water on the king's head and said, 'Oh Majesty, by this ceremony of abhiṣeka all the people of the Kṣatriya race make thee their Mahārāja for their protection.'[2] Then the Purohita poured water on the king's head with the same words only substituting 'Brāhmaṇa clans' for noble clans(Kṣatriya); finally the Seṭṭhi performed the ceremony for the householder clans(Gahapati-gaṇā). The association of the representatives of different social groups at the time of the abhiṣeka may have been intended to convey the general acceptance of the new king by the entire population of the country. This same idea is expressed in the Aggañña Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya in which the Buddhist concept of kingship is expounded; here the king is represented as one who was 'approved by the whole people'(mahā-sammata or mahā-janasammata).[3] Although it is not mentioned in the Veda ceremony that

---

1. Mv., chap. XI, XIII; C. M. Fernando, op. cit., p. 125.
2. Vpk., vol. 1, pp. 305-306.
3. D.N., vol. III, pp. 92-93.

anyone else but the officiating priest inaugurated the king by anointing him with the sacred liquid, the participation of the representatives of different classes are referred to in the Purāṇas and Epic poems.[1] Hence one could also argue that the participation of the three different representatives was included in the abhiseka in Ceylon in imitating the Hindu ceremony. The influence of Buddhism on this ceremony is further attested by the way in which the vessels used at the consecration were made. The text states that the clay for these vessels should be taken from the eight specified places and all these places seem to have been connected with Buddhist worship in Ceylon. The clay for the ceremony 'should be obtained from beneath the northern flights of steps of the Mahābodhighara, Nīla pond, Lohapāsāda. . . . pagompamālaka, and the Mahācetiya and from beneath the northern doorway of the Catussālā and from under the steps of the entrance to the hall named Samujjava where the bhikkhus used to drape their robes.'[2] The specific statement that clay should be taken from under the steps of these places shows clearly that the consecration of a king was regarded as having religious significance.

---

1. Agni Purāṇa, chap. 209; Rāmāyaṇa, 2.15.

2. Vpk., vol. 1, p. 307.

Ultimately, in the ninth century, this ceremony of abhiṣeka seems to have been held in the vihāra itself.[1]

Another significant feature of this ceremony is the importance of the Kṣatriya maiden as the first to pour water on the king's head, whereas in India the Purohita is given the first place.[2] Yet another interesting point to be noted here is that, though the Brāhmaṇa and the Gahapati were given a chance to pour water over the king's head, it becomes clear from all the available sources[3] that only the Kṣatriya maiden was necessary to perform the abhiṣeka, for the Brāhmaṇa and the Gahapati were not included in the list of 'necessaries for an abhiṣeka'.[4] Therefore it appears that the Kṣatriyas were given the prominent place at the abhiṣeka ceremony in ancient Ceylon and this seems to be quite in accordance with the Buddhist social pattern where the Kṣatriya takes precedence over the Brāhmaṇas.[5] It is also noteworthy that some of the features of the Indian ceremony,

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, v. 82.

2. Vpk., vol. 1, p. 305.

3. Mv., 11, v. 30; Samantapāsādikā, p. 37; Vpk., vol. 1, p. 3

4. Vpk., vol. 1, p. 305; John M. Seneviratne, 'Royalty in Ancient Ceylon,' J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXVI, no. 71, p. 126.

5. In Buddhist texts the Kṣatriya class is given the superiority over the Brāhmaṇas(D.N., III, pp. 84-95).

such as animal sacrifice, use of the soma juice, covering of the throne seat with a tiger skin etc., were not included in the abhiṣeka ceremony in Ceylon. The most probable reason for this is that they were not in conformity with Buddhist ideas.[1] In this connexion, it is worthwhile to draw attention to the proclamation made by Mahinda IV(956-972) in his Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription. It is remarked here that kingship was bestowed on the rulers of Laṅkā by the great community of monks for the purpose of defending their bowls and robes.[2] It further asserts that the rulers 'wont to don the white scarf (sevel) to serve and attend on the Saṅgha on the very day they celebrate the coronation-festival. . . .' The wearing of the white scarf with the assurance referred to above probably signifies a religious rite.[3] The above evidence would thus make it clear that although the ceremony of abhiṣeka was of Indian origin, it did not retain its pristine form but underwent certain modifications in accordance with the Buddhist ideology that prevailed in the Island.

---

1. C. M. Fernando, op. cit., p. 125; T. Hettiarachchy, op. cit., p. 47.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 237, lines 53-55.

3. See pp. 167-168 below.

As the compilation of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī is believed to have taken place during the period under survey,[1] it is of importance to see whether the abhiṣeka ceremony described in this work has any affinity to the ceremony prevailing during the time. With the passage of time the ceremony seems to have undergone several changes, but we cannot find in the Cūḷavaṁsa any details other than the mere mention of the ceremony. However, there seem to be indirect references indicative of such changes in contemporary records and occasionally in literary works.

As pointed out earlier[2] the sprinkling of the sacred water of the Ganges formed the chief feature of the ancient ceremony of the royal inauguration, and the ceremony itself was called the abhiṣeka. But by about the eighth century the custom of sprinkling consecrated water on the head of the king seems to have lost its place and instead, the coronation or the placing of a crown on the head of the king appears to have gained importance as the main rite in the inauguration of kings.

---

1. See p. 144 above.

2. See p. 137 above.

It is interesting to note here that the placing of the crown was not regarded as an important rite in the inauguration of kings in ancient India. The early Indian accounts do not refer to a 'coronation'(crowning) as such, but always speak of the abhiṣeka(anointing) which seems to have had precedence over all other rites. Haug also points to the same fact when he says that 'the principal part of all these ceremonies - abhiṣeka, punarabhiṣeka and mahābhiṣeka - consists in the sprinkling of holy water over the head of the kings.'[1] According to the Jātakas, 'the king was seated on a fine chair of fig-wood and was sprinkled with auspicious water . . . . then the white umbrella with its festoons of gold was uplifted.'[2] The Rāmāyaṇa while describing Rāma's consecration mentions the diadem(kirīṭa); but the account does not make it clear that the placing of the crown on the head formed a part of the ceremony of consecration.[3] The Mahābhārata, in its description of the consecration of Yudhiṣṭhira speaks only of the ceremony of abhiṣeka

---

1. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, ed. Martin Haug, p. 66.
2. Ratilal Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, p. 106.
3. Rāmāyaṇa, IV, c. 130, p. 606; M. B. Ariyapala, op. cit., appendix II.

(anointing) and makes no mention of a crown.[1] The edicts of Aśoka do not mention a coronation[2] but refer to the fact that he was anointed.[3] That this was the practice even in the age of the Guptas is made clear by the observations made by Saletore on the inauguration of the Gupta kings.[4] However, from the earliest times, the crown seems to have been an important element in the abhiṣeka ceremony in South India. One of the Sangam rulers was known as 'the Chera with the kaḷangāy festoon and the fibre crown'; the crown he wore at his coronation is said to have been made of palmyra fibre and the festoon on it contained kaḷangāy, a small blackberry.[5] In some contemporary works, Senguṭṭavan is described as an adhirāja wearing a garland of seven crowns.[6] The Kadamba ruler, Śāntivarman is said to have worn three crowns and

---

1. Mbh., S.P., 40.

2. Most writers on Hindu Polity seem to use the term 'coronation' when actually they refer to the abhiṣeka or consecration, see R. N. Saletore, Life in the Gupta age; Mookerji, Hindu Civilization; P. C. Dharma, The Rāmāyaṇa Polity; Griffith, Rāmāyaṇa.

3. Basak, Edicts of Asoka, Edict V.

4. R. N. Saletore, op. cit., p. 172.

5. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, A History of South India, p. 119. It is not explained anywhere why the king had to wear such an extraordinary tiara.

6. Ibid.

'attracted to himself the prosperity of his enemies.'[1]

The Pāṇḍya rulers are always depicted as wearing a crown. It is said that the Pāṇḍya king Mānābharaṇan wore the crown even while he was in the battlefield.[2] Mullaiyūr Sundara Pāṇḍyan was still wearing the crown when he fled from the battlefield after he had been defeated by the Coḷas.[3] In referring to the encounter with Vīra Pāṇḍya, an inscription in the nineteenth year of Kulōttunga's reign states that Kulōttunga placed his foot on Vīra Pāṇḍya's crown.[4] After the subjugation of the neighbouring territories Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, sat upon a splendid throne with his queen, and wore a golden crown 'emulating the morning sun rising on the top of the eastern hill.'[5] In one of his inscriptions, Rājendra III boasts of having taken the crowned heads of two Pāṇḍyan rulers.[6]

---

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, A History of South India, p. 111.
2. South Indian Inscriptions, vol. III, p. 56.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., vol. III, pt. II, nos. 87 and 88. The facts are narrated in two records of Kulōttunga dated in his eleventh and nineteenth years(nos. 87 and 88). The later record gives more details than the earlier, but the reference is evidently to the same incident, see K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, The Pāṇḍya Kingdom, p. 135.
5. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, The Pāṇḍya Kingdom, p. 163.
6. Annual Reports on Epigraphy(Madras) 1922, no. 515.

It is evident from the references given above that the crown was regarded as an important element in the abhiṣeka ceremony in South India. However, it cannot be said with certainty if the placing of the crown was upheld as the chief and essential rite of the ceremony. Two explanations are possible here regarding the adoption of this rite by the rulers of medieval Ceylon. Perhaps it is reasonable to assume that the 'coronation' or the giving of importance to the crowning above all other rites was a sui generis rite introduced by the rulers of medieval Ceylon when they found that it was impractical to adhere to the very letter of Indian ritualism, e.g., obtaining water from the Ganges river for the consecration of each and every king. On the other hand, it seems quite likely that this rite was adopted by the rulers of Ceylon in imitation of the inauguration ceremony in South India. The latter seems more favourable when we take into account the close relations between the two countries during this period.[1]

The 'coronation' or the placing of the crown on the head of the king seems to be the most distinctive

---

1. Cv., chap. 39, v. 20, vv. 46-49; chap. 44, vv. 70-72; chap. 47, vv. 36-37; chap. 50, vv. 12-13; chap. 52, vv. 70-72.

feature of the inauguration ceremony in medieval Ceylon. The Rambāva Slab Inscription of the tenth century states:[1]

. . . . rada vä minivuṭnen pähäyū siya mundnen lo-uturā bisevnen bisesvä, 'became king, was anointed on his head resplendent with the jewelled crown, with the unction of world-supremacy.' The same phraseology is found in the Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV(956-972).[2] In referring to the reign of Kassapa II(650-659) it is said in the Cūḷavaṁsa,'He (Kassapa) sent Dāṭhopatissa flying to Jambudīpa and united the country under one dominion, but the crown he did not wear.'[3] It is specifically mentioned here of his inability to wear the crown, most probably because it was regarded as the principal attribute of kingship during this period. The installation of Māna[4] took place, according to the Cūḷavaṁsa, by placing a crown on his head (makuṭaṁ tattha dhāresi).[5]

---

1. E.Z., vol. II, p. 67.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 221.

3. Cv., chap. 44, v. 145.

4. The identification of this king is rather difficult. He is called the eldest son of Kassapa II (Cv., chap. 45, v. 6), but it is not certain if he could be identified with Mānavamma. See Cūḷavaṁsa, p. 192, foot note 3.

5. Cv., chap. 57, v. 17.

There is no reference to his having been anointed with sacred liquid. The Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV states, 'the rules thus inacted should always be maintained with due regards by the descendants of our dynasty. . . . who are wont to wear the white scarf (sevel)[1]. . . . on the very day they celebrate the coronation festival after attaining to kingship.'[2] Here again the wearing of the white scarf has been regarded as an important aspect of the inauguration ceremony. Most probably the wearing of the white scarf was similar to that of placing the crown on the head. Paranavitana has also come to the same conclusion when he replaces the term 'white scarf' by 'diadem.'[3] No clarifying evidence is available, however, to determine the exact nature of this rite.

It is remarkable that in the succeeding period the inauguration ceremony was named 'molimaṅgalaṁ ' 'the festival of coronation.'[4] As the wearing of the crown formed the chief feature of the inauguration

---

1. Se - vel = Skt. śveta - vēṣṭa or śveta - paṭṭa, probably a turban of silk cloth. Cf.:
   Gata sav barana sädi - balamin isa sevulu bäňdi kirula da tama pälaňdi - tabā ohu mudunatehi siri räňdi (Kāvyaśekhara, XIV, v. 64).
2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 238, inscription no. 2.
3. U.H.C., pt. 1, p. 368.
4. Cv., ch. 72, v. 312.

ceremony in medieval Ceylon, the ceremony may have been named as such. The Cūḷavaṁsa refers to the inauguration ceremony of Parākramabāhu as molimaṅgala.[1] Niśśaṅka-malla (1187-1196) refers in the Galpota Slab Inscription to his inauguration ceremony as voṭunu maṅgula 'festival of coronation'.[2]

Moreover, the custom of placing the crown on the head seems to have been well-established in the period that follows. The coronation ceremony of Parākramabāhu (1153-1186) is described in the Cūḷavaṁsa: 'On a day proved auspicious by a favourable constellation he placed the crown on his head, arrayed in all his jewels'.[3] The author of the Saddharmaratnāvaliya[4] in rendering the phrase taṁ rajje abhisiñciṁsu into Sinhalese says, mahatvū raja perahärin rāja kumārayan ätulu nuvaraṭa gena voṭunu palaṅdavā rājyayehi pihiṭuvūha.[5] In this Sinhalese version, the author replaces abhisiñciṁsu (sprinkled water) by 'the placing of the crown'. Again the

---

1. Cv., chap. 72, v. 312.

2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 105.

3. Nakkhattena pasatthena dine maṅgala sammate dhāretvā sirasā moliṁ sabbābharaṇabhūsito (Cv., chap. 71, v. 28).

4. A work of the 13th century A.D. It is based on the (Pali) Dhammapadatthakathā, written in the fifth century A.D. in Ceylon.

5. Ibid., p. 173.

Saddharma-ratnāvaliya describing the coronation of Kāṣṭhavāhana says, 'having placed the crown on his head, he was made king.'[1] The Thūpa-vaṁsa[2] and the Saddharmālaṁkāraya,[3] too, use the phrase 'oṭunu pälaňda' 'having worn the crown' in describing the attainment of kingship, which no doubt refers to the inauguration. This is perhaps because by this time the principal act of inauguration was the placing of the crown on the head and not that of sprinkling the water of consecration on the head of the king. Thus the above evidence would make it clear that by about the twelfth century the coronation or the placing of the crown was well established as the chief rite in the inauguration of the kings in Ceylon. It should, however, be noted here that the origin of this new rite in Ceylon is to be traced back to the period under survey.[4] The first important reference to the crown occurs in the chronicle in the reign of Kassapa II(650-659).[5] It is noteworthy that the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī does not refer to a crown in its enumeration

---

1. Saddharma-ratnāvaliya, p. 472.
2. Thūpavaṁsa, p. 33.
3. Saddharmālaṁkāraya, p. 530.
4. See pp. 161-162 above.
5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 145.

of the 'necessaries' for an abhiṣeka.[1] The commentator, as has been suggested by Geiger,[2] may have had a knowledge of the abhiṣeka ceremony as it was performed in the medieval era, but he does not seem to have paid much attention to the traditions of his time. His main purpose was to comment on a ceremony existing in the third century B.C. and the account given in the commentary shows that he had not deviated from his motif.

It is also fascinating that we do not find any mention of the Saṅgha or the Sāsana in connexion with the abhiṣeka ceremony described in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. According to this text, three representatives of the Kṣatriya, Brāhmaṇa and the Vaiśya castes performed the abhiṣeka ceremony of the king saying, 'Sire, by this

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, pp. 304-305. According to the Mahāvaṁsa, a turban (uṇhīsaṁ) and a head-dress (moliṁ) were included among the necessaries sent by Aśoka for the consecration of Devānampiya Tissa. Geiger has rendered the term uṇhīsaṁ into English as 'a diadem.' But the explanation given by the commentator makes it clear that neither of these terms - uṇhīsaṁ and moliṁ - denotes a crown, see Vpk., vol. I, p. 304; see also M. B. Ariyapala, Society in Medieval Ceylon, pp. 368-372.

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 116.

ceremony of abhiṣeka all the people of the Kṣatriya, Brāhmaṇa and the Vaiśya race make thee their Mahārāja for their protection.'[1] There is no reference whatsoever to the Saṅgha or the Sāsana. Instead, we find the Purohita (domestic chaplain) taking part in the abhiṣeka ceremony. But after the advent of Mahinda, the influence of the Purohita as a house-priest began to decline.[2] The Brāhmaṇas were succeeded by the Buddhist Saṅgha who in due course took a prominent part not only in the religious affairs but also in the political field. On one occasion it is said in the Cūḷavaṁsa, that the sovereigns of Laṅkā, in protecting the world and the Sāsana, used to act according to the advice of a bhikkhu who held the position of a premier counsellor (mūlaṭṭhāna) and whose appoinment had to be confirmed by a divine oracle.[3] We hear of several rulers who acted according to the instructions of the Saṅgha.[4]

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, p. 305.

2. H. Ellawala, op. cit., p. 17. In a Buddhist society Brāhmaṇas had no religious rites and ceremonies to perform, and their place was occupied by bhikkhus as teachers and advisers of the community.

3. Cv., chap. 57, vv. 38-39.

4. Cv., chap. 42, v. 22; chap. 48, v. 89; chap. 57, v. 31, v. 35. For details see pp. 248-254 below.

Aggabodhi I(571-604) is said to have kept piously to the instruction of a bhikkhu named Dāṭhāsiva.[1]

The Saṅgha not only acted as advisers to the kings but also as their educators and mediators[2] when any conflict had arisen within the royal family or at court. It is certainly not a mere coincidence that in connexion with such events Brāhmaṇas are never mentioned but always the Saṅgha. Sufficient evidence can be adduced to show how the Saṅgha superseded the Brāhmaṇas as advisers to the king, and obtained a prominent position at court.[3]

The rulers of the Island, according to the Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV :

> . . . . are wont to wear the white scarf to serve and attend on the great community of monks on the very day they celebrate the coronation festival after attaining to the dignity of kingship, bestowed by the great community of monks for the purpose of defending their bowls and robes.[4]

Three facts emerge from this statement; firstly, it becomes clear that kingship was supposed to have been conferred by the Saṅgha; secondly, the protection of the

---

1. Cv., chap. 42, v. 22.

2. See pp. 243-246 below.

3. For details see pp. 243-256 below.

4. . . . . tumā pay sivur rak(nuva)s maha saṅg-hu piliväyu raj-siri päminä sänä bisev vindna(da) yas maha-(sa)ṅg-haṭ meheyaṭ uvasar-vas(sevel) bandna. . . (E.Z., vol. I, p. 237).

Saṅgha and their possessions was considered to be the supreme duty of the king; thirdly, the rulers seem to have made this promise at their abhiṣeka.[1] Apparently, there was a religious rite connected with the investiture of the king performed by the community of monks on the same day as the consecration.[2] The wearing of the white scarf with the assurance 'to serve and attend on the great community of monks on the very day they celebrate their coronation ceremony' is significant. It is quite likely that this rite was connected with the duty of protecting the Saṅgha and the Sāsana. A similar idea is found in the Vēḷaikkāra Inscription at Polonnaruva. According to this record, Vijayabāhu I put on the crown at the request of the Saṅgha in order to defend the Sāsana.[3] In his Hāṭadāge Inscription, Niśśaṅkamalla states that the protection of the Sāsana was the duty of the kings of Ceylon.[4] Thus, from these references it becomes evident that the protection of the Saṅgha

---

1. 'The wearing of the white scarf is a rite connected with the investiture of the king' (R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, 'History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha,' Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965, p. 249).

2. See p. 155 above.

3. E.I., vol. XVIII, p. 336, II. 8-9.

4. E.Z., vol. II, p. 97.

and the Sāsana was considered as the chief duty of the king. Sometimes it is said that the kings were consecrated to protect the Sāsana.[1] Therefore it is rather strange that no mention of this fact is made at their inauguration ceremonies. In this respect it is of importance to refer to a statement in the Cūḷavaṁsa[2] where it is said that Sena II(853-887) performed his abhiṣeka at the Hemavāluka Cetiya (the same as the Mahā-thūpa in Anurādhapura, now Ruvanväli Dāgäba). According to the Slab Inscription of Vēḷaikkāras, the temple of the Tooth Relic built by Vijayabāhu I in Vijayarājapuram became also the auspicious house for the abhiṣeka ceremony.[3] These references are further indicative of the fact that the rulers of our period showed a great allegiance towards the Saṅgha. Hence it is very likely that, at least by about the eighth century, the rulers made a promise to protect the Saṅgha and the Sāsana at the time when they underwent the abhiṣeka ceremony.

---

1. E.I., vol. XVIII, p. 336, II. 8-9.
2. Cv., chap. 51, v. 82.
3. E.Z., vol. II, p. 242.

The reason why the commentator did not mention this fact in his account can be explained in a different way. As we have mentioned earlier the account given by the commentator is in fact an excerpt from the Sīhala-ṭṭhakathā written in the pre-Christian centuries. It is possible that the compiler of the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā in writing this description followed the details of the abhiṣeka ceremony of Devānampiya Tissa. The advent of Mahinda took place after the consecration of Devānampiya Tissa and at the time of Devānampiya Tissa's consecration, Buddhism was not established in the Island. Hence the abhiṣeka ceremony of the above ruler seems to have been performed according to Indian ritual referring only to the duty expected from the king towards the Kṣatriyas, Brāhmaṇas and Vaiśyas.

But a few centuries later, Buddhism became well established in the Island and the Saṅgha, as its representatives, took a leading role in religious work as well as in political affairs.[1] On the other hand, the rulers of Ceylon, apart from a few exceptions, always considered the protection of the Saṅgha and the Sāsana as their foremost duty. This is evident from / the fact that

---

1. For details see pp. 237-257 below.

almost all the rulers of the Island made numerous donations to the Saṅgha and the Sāsana soon after they became king. The Cūḷavaṁsa and the inscriptions testify to such donations made by the rulers of the period under discussion.[1] Since the welfare of the Saṅgha and the Sāsana has been considered as one of the chief duties of the king, it is not unlikely that at the time kingship was bestowed on them they made a promise to fulfil this duty.

From the evidence we have so far given we are perhaps justified in making the following conjectures with regard to the abhiṣeka ceremony of the rulers of the period under survey. Although the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī is a work of this period, the vivid description of the abhiṣeka given in it has but little affinity to the abhiṣeka ceremony of its times. As the account of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī is based on a work of the third or second century B.C., it is very likely that it gives

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 172-175; chap. 38, v. 43, vv. 70-72; chap. 41, v. 29, v. 57; chap. 42, v. 41, vv. 56-57, v. 61, v. 63; chap. 44, v. 49, v. 65, vv. 96-101; chap. 46, v. 5, vv. 7-8; chap. 48, vv. 1-2, v. 37; chap. 49, v. 47, v. 87; chap. 50, vv. 68-72; chap. 51, v. 68; chap. 52, v. 23, v. 59; chap. 53, v. 32; E.Z., vol. I, p. 221, p. 227; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 219-225; E.Z., vol. I, p. 52, p. 25, p. 29, p. 165.

a description of the ceremony as it was conducted in the pre-Christian centuries. The ceremony of abhiṣeka was introduced to the Island apparently as a Hindu rite. But, with the passage of time it went through many modifications under the influence of Buddhism on one hand and that of the pattern of Sinhalese society on the other. For instance, by about the eighth century A.D. the placing of the crown on the head of the king was considered more important than that of sprinkling water from the Ganges. Thus the abhiṣeka ceremony of our period differs in certain respects from the ceremony of ancient Ceylon. Hence, it is not justifiable to suppose that the abhiṣeka ceremony of our period was carried out in the precise manner described by the author of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. It is interesting to note here that there were occasions even in the preceding period when the rulers did not adhere to the details given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. According to this text, three distinct persons - the Kṣatriya maiden, the Purohita (royal chaplain) and the Setthi - are necessary to perform the abhiṣeka of a king.[1] But there were at least a few occasions when these personages did not

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, p. 305.

participate and the ceremony was conducted by others. Thūlatthana is said to have been consecrated by his ministers, but the latter in this case - since Lañjitissa is the rightful heir - were careful to do it 'with the consent of the Saṅgha.'[1] According to the Mahāvaṁsa, Mahāsena's abhiṣeka was carried out by the thera Saṁghamitta, 'who came thither from the further coast to consecrate him.'[2]

But, it is remarkable that in every age the description of the abhiṣeka ceremony given by the author of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, or in other words, the abhiṣeka ceremony of ancient Ceylon, seems to have been considered as the ideal model of the abhiṣeka. The account of this ceremony given in the Sārātthadīpanī[3] proves the fact that the description in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī itself was regarded as the ideal ceremony in the succeeding period, too.[4] This tradition seems to have continued

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXIII, v. 18.

2. Ibid., chap. XXXVII, v. 2.

3. A work of the 12th century A.D. The author himself says, in his introductory verses, that he composed this work during the reign of Parākramabāhu the Great.

4. Sārātthadīpanī, Sinhalese edition (1914), p. 140.

as late as the eighteenth century A.D. as is evidenced by a description made in 1769. 'What ceremonies are observed at the coronation of a king?' asked Governor Von Falk in 1769 and the answer given by 'some of the best informed Kandyan bhikkhus' was in fact a summary of the interesting description given in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī.[1] But it is very unlikely that the actual ceremony of the rulers of the Kandyan period was performed in the manner described by these bhikkhus. This may become clear by the account given by John Davy on the coronation of a Kandyan king:

> Another ceremony remained to be performed before the prince could be considered completely king; it was that of choosing a name and putting on the regal sword. . . . On the day fixed, which was sometimes a year or two after the election, the prince went in great state to the Mahā-Viṣṇu devāle, where he presented offerings and made prostrations to the god. Thence, he passed to the Nāta devāle, and having gone through the same religious ceremony, he inspected the plates, chose the name that pleased him, and read it to the first Adikar, who proclaimed aloud, - 'This is the name that the gods have chosen for the king to bear.' Then the gold plate, the nalapaṭa, on which the name was inscribed, was tied to the prince's forehead by a member of the Pilima Talavve family, which being of royal descent enjoyed this privilege and that of putting on the regal sword, which was attached to a belt that passed over the shoulder, and came round the waist. The sword having been girded on the prince, the kapurāla presented a pot

---

1. A. Bertolacci, Ceylon, pp. 454-455. Cf. the summary and the description given in appendix I.

> of sandal-powder, in which the prince, who may now be called king, dipped his fingers and touched the sword; and this ceremony was performed in the Mahā, as well as in the Nāta-devāle.[1]

There is still a stone in Kandy (opposite the old palace) on which the later kings of Kandy sat in public, when they were girded with the sword of kingship.[2] Thus it appears that even though the actual abhiṣeka of the Kandyan period differed from that of the ancient ceremony, the ideal abhiṣeka still upheld was that described in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī. As pointed out above, the Kandyan bhikkhus, when they were asked of the manner in which the abhiṣeka was performed, have given a summary of the description in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī,[3] most probably because the ancient ceremony was resuscitated as the customary abhiṣeka. Two explanations can be adduced here regarding the importance attached to the ancient ceremony. The description of the abhiṣeka given by the author of the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī may have

---

1. John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants, pp. 158-164. For a complete description of this ceremony see appendix II. We have included as an appendix the description of the abhiṣeka ceremony in the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī, the description of the ceremony given by Kandyan monks in 1769 and as well as Davy's account of the coronation of a Kandyan king, because a comparison of these accounts would make it clear the view that we have brought forward to.

2. C. M. Fernando, op. cit., p. 128.

3. Cf. the description and the summary in appendix I.

been considered as the ideal ceremony, firstly, because it was the description of the full-fledged ceremony introduced to the Island under the auspices of the great Emperor Aśoka, secondly, because it deals with the abhiṣeka of the first historical ruler of the Island.

The purpose for which the royal consecration of a mortal king is carried out is defined by the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in precisely the same terms as those contained in the passage that describes the inauguration of Indra[1] (with the obvious alteration of 'amongst men' instead of 'amongst gods'). The priest who performs the mahābhiṣeka on a king wishes that 'a Kṣatriya should conquer in all the various ways of conquest, to subjugate all people, and that he should attain to leadership, precedence, and supremacy over all kings, and attain everywhere and at all times to universal sovereignty, enjoyment(of pleasures), independence, distinguished distinction as a king, the fulfilment of the highest desires, the position of a king, of a great king, and supreme mastership, that he might cross (with his arms) the universe, and become the ruler of the whole earth (Prajāpati) during all his life.'[2]

---

1. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 15; trans. M. Haug, vol. II, pp. 515-516.

2. Ibid., p. 519.

Every ruler in Ceylon, apart from a few exceptions,[1] seems to have considered the abhiṣeka an essential rite. The Sammohavinodanī states: rājānoti muddhāvasitta- Khattiyā 'kings mean the Kṣatriyas who were consecrated',[2] and the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī says, rājānoti abhisittā 'kings mean those who were consecrated'.[3] Thus it appears that the abhiṣeka of a ruler was regarded as essential for any society.[4] This is further illustrated by a statement in the Cūḷavaṁsa although it is made in connexion with a ruler in the succeeding period. The chronicler, referring to Vikramabāhu (1111-1132) in a passage put into the thoughts of Mānābharaṇa and his two brothers, remarks: 'How in Rājaraṭṭha of the kings of consecrated head dare this single man hold sway, without the royal consecration'.[5] The importance of abhiṣeka is pointed out once again in a subsequent verse

---

1. Mahinda I never underwent the abhiṣeka ceremony (Cv., chap. 48, vv. 26-31).

2. Sammohavinodanī, p. 518.

3. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, p. 924.

4. Mbh., S.P., XII, 67. 2.

5. Cv., chap. 61, vv. 29-30.

in the chronicle. As Parākramabāhu (1153-1186), shortly after the demise of Gajabāhu, arrived in Polonnaruva, the high dignitaries of Dakkhiṇadesa are said to have requested him to have the royal consecration carried out, pointing out to him that the former kings, when they were victorious, performed that ceremony even while they were still in the battle-field in order to display their glory and to increase the fear and affection of their subjects.[1]

The king was expected, if he was to be in full possession of the royal dignity, to undergo the ceremony of consecration,[2] to which a great deal of importance seems to have been attached during the period under consideration. As has been pointed out by Ralph Pieris,[3] the abhiṣeka ceremony seems to have had a great functional significance due to the absence of a rigid tradition of hereditary kingship in Ceylon. 'Designed to turn men into gods, in later times it generated charisma in the chosen candidate for the throne by means of an elaborate ritual, thus

---

1. Cv., chap. 71, vv. 19-21.

2. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. I, p. 21; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII. 15.

3. Ralph Pieris, Sinhalese Social Organization, p. 11.

legitimating his authority.'[1] It is interesting to note here that at least during the period under survey, only the consecrated rulers had the right to use such official titles as 'raja' and 'maharaja.' In the Cūlavaṁsa we are told of a prince named Mahinda (730-733) who carried out the duties of a king without royal consecration,[2] and it further states that he ruled the country bearing only the epithet of ādipāda.[3] It is remarkable that neither in the chronicle nor in his inscriptions Mahinda I is given the title of raja. The Viraṅdagoḍa Pillar Inscription refers to him as 'mahayay Mihiṅdu.'[4] Thus it is apparent that he was known by the title ādipāda or mahādipāda during his reign because he was not consecrated as king. We hear of another ruler who ruled the country 'without wearing the crown' (makuṭaṁ na dhārayi).[5] As has been pointed out earlier,[6] the placing of the

---

1. Ralph Pieris, op. cit., p. 11.
2. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 26-28.
3. Ibid., chap. 48, v. 31.
4. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 123.
5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 145.
6. See pp. 160-164 above.

crown was regarded as the chief rite of the inaugura-ceremony during this period. Therefore it is most likely that by the phrase makuṭaṁ na dhārayi it was meant that he did not undergo the consecration ceremony. Apparently yuvarāja Kassapa was not given the title raja in the narrative in the Cūḷavaṁsa.[1] The inference that the title of raja was not bestowed on the rulers who had not undergone a consecration ceremony is further confirmed by an episode given in the Cūḷavaṁsa. According to the Cūḷavaṁsa, Mahinda II (777-797) became king after the death of Aggabodhi VII (772-777).[2] But in the narrative that follows about the war between Mahinda II and his opponents, the former is nowhere referred to as raja. He is still called senāpati.[3] The title of raja occurs for the first time to denote Mahinda in the verse that follows the account of his success.[4] It is not without purpose that the royal title is here for the first time awarded to Mahinda. In times of war and disturbance the abhiseka was performed

---

1. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 145-155; chap. 45, vv. 1-10.
2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 89(rajjaṁ ganhi sasādhanaṁ).
3. Ibid., chap. 48, v. 92, v. 94, v. 96, v. 102.
4. Ibid., chap. 48, v. 113.

when the government of the new king appeared to be firmly established.[1] Therefore, it is quite likely that he only underwent the ceremony of consecration after his victory over his opponents. It is of importance to note here a remark made by Geiger regarding the sudden occurrence of the title raja to denote Mahinda. Geiger writes: 'It is not by chance that the royal title is here for the first time awarded to Mahinda. At the beginning of the campaign against Dappula, he (Mahinda II) was still called senāpati. Probably he only underwent the ceremony of consecration (abhiṣeka) after his marriage with the widow of his predecessor, as a queen must also take part therein'.[2] Therefore, on the strength of the above evidence it is reasonable to conclude that at least during the period under consideration, the bestowal of the title of raja was bound with the abhiṣeka of a king.

Apart from the abhiṣeka, it was necessary for a king to possess the royal treasure (rājasādhana) without which his dignity would have been imperfect. A king seems to have had two sets of ornaments, one, the royal insignia and the other his personal ornaments. The

---

1. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 116.

2. Cv., p. 121, n. 1.

five insignia of royalty and the sixty-four ornaments (rājasādhana)are often referred to in literature. The five royal insignia were known as the rājakakudhabhaṇḍāni.[1] In rendering the term rājakakudhāni the Saddharmaratnāvaliya[2] names five, viz., maṅgul kaḍuva (royal sword), hela kuḍaya (white umbrella), naḷal paṭa (forehead band), valvidunā (yaktail fan), ranmirivädi saṅgala (royal golden slippers). The Saddharmālaṁkāraya and the Pūjāvaliya refer to the same five.[3] Geiger's observations regarding the royal insignia are of interest: 'To the articles of the regalia (rājasādhana or rājabhaṇḍa) belong also the umbrella (chatta) and the so-called ekāvalī, a chain consisting of one row of pearls. . . When Aggabodhi III flees, he takes the string of pearls (ekāvalī) with him. It is expressly said of Dāṭhopatissa, that he became king without the ekāvalī, thus some thing of his dignity is wanting'.[4] Geiger here refers to the ekāvalī as one of the royal insignia. The incident that he alludes to makes it amply /

---

1. nikkhippa pañca kakudhāni kāsīnam raṭṭha vaḍḍhano vālavījaniṁ uṇhīsaṁ khaggaṁ chattaṁ upāhanaṁ (Jātaka V, Saṁkicca Jātaka, p. 264). Rājakakudhabhaṇḍa are the regalia, the most sacred and ceremonial objects every ruler is expected to possess. The other royal treasure are the sixty-four ornaments which the king was wont to wear on festival occasions. Cf. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 125

2. Saddharmaratnāvaliya, p. 308.

3. Saddharmālaṁkāraya, p. 186; Pūjāvaliya, p. 113.

4. Cv., p. 187, n. 2.

clear that the ekāvali was an essential treasure of the king. However, the other records do not make it clear that this ornament was one of the five insignia of royalty (rājakakudhabhaṇḍāni). The other reference in the Cūḷavaṁsa to the ekāvali also shows that it was a highly valued treasure of the king, for it is said that Aggabodhi IV (667-683) made a rosary out of the ekāvali, 'bearing in mind the splendid qualities of the Three Jewels.'[1] The five insignia were known from earliest times as essential belongings of a king. That these were necessary for a consecration ceremony is seen from the fact that Aśoka is said to have sent them with the other articles for Devānampiya Tissa's consecration.[2]

The royal treasure, especially the five insignia of royalty, were regarded as the most ceremonial and sacred objects of the state which ought to be carefully guarded, If a king lost them it was almost as bad as losing his kingdom, for he who possessed them could claim the kingdom.[3] This is why the kings were careful to carry away with them these treasures whenever they

---

1. Cv., chap. 46, v. 17. Three Jewels, viz., Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha.

2. Mv., chap. II, v. 28; Vpk., vol. I, p. 304.

3. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 124.

had cause to flee from their capitals. When Kassapa, the son of Upatissa II (517-518), realized the uselessness of resistance against the mighty usurper Silākāla, he fled to the hill-country of Malaya taking with him his parents and the royal treasure.[1] A new king was always anxious to seize first of all the regalia in order to legalize therewith his possession of the throne. It is said that Moggallāna I (491-508), after the suicide of his brother Kassapa I (473-491), took the whole of the royal treasure and entered the capital to ascend the throne (sabbaṁ sādhanaṁ ādāya).[2] After the death of Aggabodhi IV (667-683) as there was no heir, the people secured the regalia (rājabhaṇḍaṁ) and brought them to Anurādhapura.[3] When Aggabodhi VII (772-777) died, the heir-apparent Mahinda came from Mahātittha and having defeated his opponents seized the royal power together with the royal treasure.[4] It is also interesting to note here that it was considered necessary for the Coḷa king (Parāntaka) to obtain the regalia of the Pāṇḍya king in order to become consecrated as king in the Pāṇḍya

---

1. Cv., chap. 41, vv. 10-20.
2. Cv., chap. 39, v. 28.
3. Ibid., chap. 46, v. 38.
4. Ibid., chap. 48, v. 89 (rajjaṁ gaṇhi sasādhanaṁ).

kingdom. In the reign of Dappula IV (924-935), the Paṇḍu king through fear of the Coḷa king left his country and fled to Ceylon carrying with him the crown jewels and other valuables.[1] Meanwhile, the Coḷa king (Parāntaka) carried out the complete subjugation of the Pāṇḍya country, and when the country had been conquered he wanted to have a formal consecration in the Pāṇḍya capital.[2] But he could not carry this out without the Pāṇḍya regalia. Therefore, when Udaya IV (946-954) was ruling in Ceylon, the Cūḷavaṁsa records: 'as he (the Coḷa king) wished to achieve consecration as king in the Pāṇḍya kingdom, he sent (messengers) concerning the diadem and the other (things) which the Pāṇḍya king had left behind (in Laṅkā).'[3] The Coḷas, when they seized Mahinda V (982-1029) in the year 1017 A.D., also took possession of the whole royal treasure - the jewels, the diadem, the priceless diamond bracelet, the unbreakable sword and the relic of the torn strip of cloth (chinnapaṭṭikādhātu) - and sent them to the Coḷa king.[4] The Coḷa king claimed therewith

---

1. Cv., chap. 53, vv. 6-10.
2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 346.
3. Cv., chap. 53, v. 41.
4. Ibid., chap. 55, vv. 16-17, v. 19.

symbolically the dominion over the Island.

The personal ornaments of the king were sixty-four in number (sūsäṭa ābharaṇa).[1] The literature often describes a king as being decked with the sixty-four ornaments.[2] However, there seems to be a difference of opinion regarding the number. In Sinhalese literary works, it is said that the king wore sixty-four ornaments and a crown,[3] thus making the number sixty-five. Some are of opinion that the sixty-four included the crown as well. But we do not have any conclusive evidence to decide whether the crown was, or was not included in the sixty-four.

Of the five ensigns or symbols of royalty the white parasol (seta-chatta) was the one most directly associated in the popular mind with duly constituted authority and symbolical of kingly rank. The phrase 'to raise the white umbrella' (ussāpiya setacchattaṁ)[4] means the same as to 'ascend the throne' and the phrase

---

1. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 125; E. W. Perera, Ceylon notes and Queries, III (1914), p. XXXVI; M. B. Ariyapala, op. cit., p. 373-376.

2. sūsäṭak ābharaṇa pälaňda ruvan räsin diliyena anargha vū oṭunnak pälaňda, (the king) wearing the sixty-four ornaments and a precious crown resplendent with gold (Pūjāvaliya, p. 283); see also Thūpavaṁsa, ed. D. E. Hettiaratchi, p. 80.

3. Ibid.

4. Cv., chap. 55, v. 1.

'to unite Laṅkā under one umbrella'[1] is the same as 'to govern the whole Island.' Moggallāna I (491-508), immediately after the victory over his brother, went to pay his respects to the Saṅgha. 'As he was pleased with the Saṅgha,' says the Cūlavaṁsa, 'he as a mark of distinction, presented the Saṅgha with his umbrella.'[2] But the Saṅgha readily gave it back to Moggallāna. This act undoubtedly symbolizes a belief current at the time. The Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV illustrates this belief explicitly when it says that the dignity of kingship was bestowed (on the rulers of Laṅkā) by the Saṅgha.[3] Hence, it is quite likely that Moggallāna, too, attempted to uphold this belief by offering the white parasol - the symbol of sovereignty - to the Saṅgha.[4]

---

1. ekacchattena vattetuṁ (Cv., chap. 64, v. 33).

2. chattena Saṅghaṁ pūjesi (Cv., chap. 39, v. 31).

3. tumā pay sivur rak(nuva)s maha-Saṅg-hu piliväyū raj siri päminä sänä. . . . 'to serve and attend on the great community of monks. . . . after attaining to the dignity of kingship, bestowed by the great community of monks' (E.Z., vol. I, p. 238).

4. A similar instance is recorded in one of the commentaries. According to this work, Saddhātissa (137-119) offered the kingdom to a thera named Kāla Buddharakkhita. On receiving it the Thera remarked, 'O great king, you have expressed your sense of devotion. We, on our part, return to you the kingdom given to us. Rule righteously and justly' (Papañcasūdanī II, p. 295).

In the inscriptions the date is generally given by the words 'in such and such a year after the elevation of the umbrella.'[1] The significance of the white umbrella as the symbol of kingship is also made clear by a narrative in the Cūḷavaṁsa. 'The king'(Saṁghatissa), says the Cūḷavaṁsa, 'was in the centre between the two hostile armies, therefore his forces had to be divided against the rebel (Moggallāna) and the senāpati. The king's elephant sought the shade of a madhūka tree (Bassia latifolia) whereupon the umbrella fell to the ground because it knocked against a branch. The rebel's army saw that, took possession of it and handed it over to their commander. He raised the umbrella, standing on the summit of the mountain. Then the king's army thinking he was now king, came and surrounded him'.[2] The umbrella as a symbol of royalty was known to the whole of India from ancient times. A chatta (umbrella) was according to the tradition among the presents sent by Aśoka to Devānampiya Tissa.[3] The latter

---

1. tumā sat läňgu navavana havuruduyehi etc., (E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, line 10, p. 33, lines 6-7, p. 47, line 13, p. 91, lines 3-4, p. 117, line 3, p. 246, lines 4-5; E.Z., vol. II, p. 4).

2. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 18-20.

3. Mv., chap. XI, v. 28.

himself dedicated the white umbrella to the eight-shoots of the sacred Bodhi tree to honour them like kings.[1] It is also noteworthy that out of the five insignia of royalty, the white parasol (seta-chatta) was the one most en evidence on all state occasions. In fact, no state function or public festival was complete unless the king had his seta-chatta. In preparation for the arrival of the relics, the thera Mahinda utters these words to Devānampiya Tissa: 'Go thou, in the evening, mounted on thy state elephant, bearing the white parasol.'[2] And later when the Bodhi tree came, Devānampiya Tissa 'worshipped them by the gift of a white parasol and bestowed royal consecration on them.'[3] Thus it is evident that the chatta was regarded as the symbol of sovereignty from earliest times up to the end of the period under survey. But by about the twelfth century A.D., the chatta lost its importance and was superseded by the Tooth and Bowl Relics of the Buddha as the symbol of royalty. However, it is remarkable that neither the Tooth Relic nor the Bowl Relic was included in the royal

---

1. Mv., chap. XIX, v. 59.
2. Mv., chap. XVII, v. 7.
3. Mv., chap. XIX, v. 59.

treasure (rājasādhana) of the rulers of the period under discussion. Instead, we find reference to the chinna-pattikadhātu.[1] As Geiger has observed, this means a relic consisting of a torn piece of stuff from the robe of the Buddha.[2] The including of a relic of the Buddha in the regalia of the kings of our period is significant as this further proves the influence of Buddhism on the kingship in Ceylon.

---

1. Cv., chap. 55, v. 17.

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 127.

CHAPTER V

NATURE OF KINGSHIP

No texts on political theory setting out the rules of statecraft to be followed by kings have come to light in Ceylon during the period under consideration. Therefore, it appears to be a somewhat difficult task to draw a clear picture of the nature of kingship from the scanty data available in the inscriptions and literary records.

In ancient Ceylon, especially the Buddhist monks mastered the art of writing,[1] but we learn from various suttas that talking about kings and ministers, rebels and robbers, armies, wars and battles, villages, towns, cities and provinces and the like is denounced by the Buddha as 'animal talk' (tiracchāna-kathā), and that bhikkhus are prohibited from indulging in such low and mean talk.[2] Such rules may have therefore debarred the bhikkhus from

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 46-61.

2. D.N., I, p. 9; Mahāvagga, I, pp. 32, 34, 90, 92; III, p. 7; IV, p. 4; A.N., IV, pp. 163-164.

composing political treatises. This is evident from the measures taken by the authors of the Mahāvaṁsa and the Cūḷavaṁsa not to violate the Vinaya Nīti (disciplinary rules) referred to above. The authors of these works have tried to compose their works in conformity with the rules set forth in the commentaries. The commentaries maintain that at the end of a talk about kings and ministers and such others, if one reflects that even such powerful personages were subject to death and decay, the talk becomes a topic of meditation (kammaṭṭhāna).[1] So, invariably at the end of every chapter of the Mahāvaṁsa and Cūḷavaṁsa the authors include a verse containing the idea of the impermanence of life or some spiritual admonition.[2] There is spiritual advice interspersed in suitable places within the body of the chapters, too. And, further, each chapter ends with a formula which says that the Mahāvaṁsa was 'written for the serene joy

---

1. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, p. 65.

2. Sabbe p'ete dharaṇipatayo maccum accetum ante
no sakkhiṁsūpacitasubalā sādhusampannabhogā
evaṁ sabbe nidhanavasagā honti sattā ti niccaṁ
rāgaṁ sammā vinayatu dhane jīvite cāpi dhīmā.

'For all the power they had amassed and for all the glorious splendours they had enjoyed all the rulers of the earth were at the end unable to escape death. With the thought: thus all beings are subject to the law of decay, the wise man should forever entirely forsake the desire for wealth and even for life' (Cv., chap. 37, v. 248).

and emotion of the pious'.[1] The authors thus seem to have attempted to introduce their works not as a history dealing with the stories of kings and ministers and rebels and wars, but as a moralistic story, 'a topic of meditation', intended to teach the impermanence of life and to infuse serene joy and emotion into readers' minds.

The author of the Dīpavaṁsa, too, after enumerating the list of names from Mahāsammata down to Prince Siddhattha, suddenly inserts the verse beginning with aniccā vata saṅkhārā,[2] signifying the impermanence of worldly things, as if he had recited the whole list of names of the Mahāsammata dynasty in order to prove the impermanence of things. This, too, was in conformity with the idea expressed in the commentaries. Thus, it is clear that the interest of the Saṅgha in the composition of political works was minimized to a great extent by disciplinary rules. Hence they contemplated mainly on religious and literary works paying but little attention to political treatises.

On the other hand, it was not considered necessary to compile such texts because, 'If it be asked why with the exception of the Buddhist law no method for arriving

---

1. Sujanappasāda saṁvegatthāya kate Mahāvaṁse (Mv., chap. X, v. 106). See also Cv., chap. 37, v. 248, chap. 38, v. 11

2. Dīpavaṁsa, chap. III, v. 50.

at legal conclusions has as yet been set forth in writing in this kingdom of Sinhala, it may be answered that the kings and ministers of Laṅkā, from the fact of their having been from time immemorial descendants of the same family, and from their intimate acquaintance with the national character and habits, were well experienced in the traditional law, and knew what was legal and what was not'.[1] As this was the tradition upheld throughout the history of the Island, we do not possess for ancient or medieval Ceylon any lengthy theoretical texts on political philosophy. And, at the same time our knowledge of the day-to-day administration of ancient Ceylon is inadequate. Therefore, the data that can be obtained from the Culavaṁsa and inscriptions of our period will have to be supplemented by the notions of kingship referred to in later political and literary works in order to acquire a clearer view of the nature of kingship during the period under survey.

Hardly any book has been written on political theory in the later period. The only work of this nature that has been so far come to light is an unpublished

---

1. Nīti-Nighaṇḍuva, p. 2.

treatise called Lak Raja Lō Sirita.[1] This work, though belonging to a very late period,[2] refers on many occasions to the traditions and laws existing in the country from ancient times. Apart from this invaluable treatise, some literary works of the post-Anurādhapura period - Butsaraṇa,[3] Pūjāvaliya,[4] Nikāya Saṅgrahaya,[5] Saddharmaratnāvaliya[6] - produce very useful data on the nature of kingship in ancient Ceylon. Although a few books have been written during the period under consideration,[7] these works lack

---

1. British Museum, palm-leaf Ms., OR 6603 (65) 665. A part of this valuable work has been included as appendix III for the reasons that

   (a) This is the only work so far discovered which contains an account of the political and traditional laws of the country

   (b) It sheds some light on the aspect of kingship discussed in this chapter.

2. It is said to have been compiled in 1769 A.D.

3. A work of the 12th century. See M. B. Ariyapala, Society in Medieval Ceylon, p. 25.

4. According to the author himself, the book was written at the request of the minister Deva Patirāja in the 30th year of the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270).

5. A work of the 14th century.

6. This is attributed to the 13th century.

7. Sikha-valaňda Vinisa, Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, Siyabaslakara. See Ananda Kulasuriya, Siṁhala Sāhityaya, I, pp. 72-89, 97-100, 218-225.

such information. Hence, in the discussion that follows on the nature and ideals of the state, we may have to cite examples from later works in order to build up a more complete picture of these aspects of kingship in Ceylon.

Raja (P. rāja, Skt. rājan) is the most commonly used term for 'king'. The term raja has been explained as a derivative of the root rañj[1] as well as rāj.[2] Dikshitar, taking the word rājan as based on the root rañj, upon the authority of the Mahābhārata and the Dīgha Nikāya,[3] assumes that kingship was established in order to please the people, and that this function of the king was always prominent in Hindu India.[4] But according to most Indian sources,[5] there was a time of anarchy in early times and it was the oppression and high-handedness of the unjust that brought the institution of kingship into being. The Śāntiparvan elucidates this more explicitly when it says

---

1. V. R. R. Dikshitar, Hindu Administrative Institutions, p. 56.

2. H. Sastri, Amarakoṣa, p. 267.

3. The etymology given in the Dīgha Nikāya is dhammena pare rañjeti ti rājā, 'king means he who gladdens others with his righteousness' (D.N., III, p. 93).

4. V. R. R. Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 56.

5. Dīgha Nikāya, III, pp. 84-86; Mahābhārata, Śāntiparvan, chap. 58. 12; Ādipurāna, III, 30 ff.

that there was a moral degeneration in society after the golden age of harmony and happiness and Brahmadeva, the chief god, pondering over the matter came to the conclusion that human society could survive only if a code of law was framed and enforced by the authority of a king. He then composed a comprehensive code, created a son named Virajas, appointed him king and men agreed to obey his orders.[1] Thus, according to the theory given above, the necessity of a king arose from the need to protect the people rather than to please them.

The Aggañña Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya[2] also relates a similar legend about a golden age when life was happy without a king or laws nor any other social restrictions. In time, however, decay set in and troubles began. Then the men gathered together and, lamenting the appearance of the four evils,[3] chose the most handsome and capable individual among themselves to be their leader. He was expected to be wrathful when indignation was right, to censure that which should rightly be

---

1. Mbh., S.P., chap. 58, 12.

2. D.N. (P.T.S.), III, pp. 84-95.

3. For a detailed discussion see U. N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, pp. 62-63.

censured and to banish him who deserved to be banished, and they agreed to give him in return a portion of their crops. The story given in the Dīgha Nikāya further implies that the necessity of a king was felt in order to protect people and also to maintain law and order in society rather than to please them.

It cannot be said with certainty how the institution of kingship originated in Ceylon.[1] The account given in the chronicles about the colonization of the Island is largely legendary in character, embellished with stories taken from the Jātakas and other sources.[2] However, it is believed that the institution of kingship came into being in Ceylon with the advent of the Āryans from India.[3] There was almost certainly more than one stream of Āryan immigrants from India as is evidenced by the stories of Paṇḍuvāsudeva and Bhaddakaccānā.[4] In the course of time these immigrants must have settled down in the Island and as these settlements spread and increased

---

1. See T. Hettiarachchy, History of Kingship in Ceylon (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970), pp. 9-51.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 47; cf. also G. C. Mendis, 'The Vijaya Legend', Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, pp. 263-292.

3. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon' J.R.A.S. (1936), p. 459.

4. Mv., chap. VIII, vv. 4-28.

they must have felt the necessity of a leader, not only for defending themselves against possible aggression from outside, but also for internal peace.[1] Hence, it is reasonable to believe that in Ceylon, too, kingship was bound up with the idea of protection.

As has been rightly observed by Spellman that 'no one can claim to know the precise origins of government. It is nevertheless important to try to establish what people believe to have been the origins because in those beliefs we are able to see more clearly their concepts of government'.[2] Thus a survey of the speculations on the origin of the state in the Mahābhārata, Dīgha Nikāya and the Mahāvaṁsa shows that whatever may have been the state of affairs in the mythical past, kingship was regarded as an indispensable institution for the protection of people and progress of society.

A king, therefore, seems to have been considered absolutely necessary in every age. The Śānti Parvan gives us some illustration of what the world would look like without a king. 'As all creatures become unable to

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S. (1936), p. 459.

2. John W. Spellman, Political Theory of Ancient India, p. 1.

see one another and sink in utter darkness if the sun and the moon do not rise, as fishes in shallow water and birds in a spot safe from danger, dart and rove as they please (for a time) and repeatedly attack and grind one another with force and then meet with certain destruction, even so men sink in utter darkness and meet with destruction if they have no king to protect them, like a herd of cattle without a herdsman to look after them'.[1] The necessity of kingship has been well explained in Jātaka stories, too: 'A woman without a husband, a river run dry and a realm (rattha) without a king are naked';[2] 'one needs a king and a warrior for protection';[3] 'a realm without a king cannot be protected and it cannot stand'.[4] Similar ideas are found in the inscriptions of Ceylon. It is said in the North Gate Slab Inscription of Niśśaṅka-malla: 'It is not right to live without a king. So whenever there is no one holding the position of paramount king, then either the heir-apparent, or if there is no such personage, one of the princes, failing

---

1. Mbh., Ś.P., 68, 850.
2. Jātaka, 1, p. 307.
3. Ibid., IV, p. 296.
4. Ibid., VI, p. 39, p. 160.

them, one of the princesses, should be chosen for the kingdom'.[1] Another inscription of the succeeding period expresses this view more explicitly when it says that 'a kingdom without a king, like a ship without a steersman, would not endure; like a day without the sun it would be lustreless'.[2]

The above quotations make it clear that the necessity of there being a king, in the interest of the protection of people in particular and the maintenance of public order in general, was well recognized in different periods.

There were occasions when some powerful officers of the state acted as de facto rulers. Yet they considered it absolutely essential to have a king, even nominally. After the death of Aggabodhi IV (667-683), Potthakuṭṭha captured the kingdom and took the uparāja Daṭhāsiva prisoner. But, he could not have himself consecrated as king most probably because he did not belong to the royal family. Yet, he thought, 'without a king it is impossible to rule the earth',[3] and fetched the chief of Dhanapiṭṭhi, Datta by name, who belonged to the royal

---

1. E.Z., vol. II, p. 163.

2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 227.

3. vinā rañña na sakkā ti medinim paribhuñjitum (Cv., chap. 46, v. 41.

family, consecrated him king and administered the kingdom in his name. After Datta's death, Potthakuṭṭha summoned another, Hatthadāṭha by name, consecrated him king and acted as before.[1] This episode proves that, although Potthakuṭṭha acted as the de facto ruler of the kingdom in the reigns of the two rulers mentioned above, the necessity of having a legitimate ruler - even if he was only a figure-head - was not overlooked. We hear of a similar episode in the succeeding period when a general named Āyasmanta acted as the king-maker.[2] On one occasion it is said that Āyasmanta appointed a five-months old infant to the throne - just for the sake of having a nominal legitimate ruler - and ruled the kingdom in his name.[3]

While discussing the definition of the term raja, we have en passant referred to the conception that the ancient people had of the nature of the state.[4] They

---

1. Cv., chap. 46, vv. 39-46.

2. Pūjāvaliya, p. 108; see also Rājāvaliya, p. 43.

3. The fact that Āyasmanta could raise to the throne three rulers, two of whom he deposed, shows that he was the strong man of the time - a king maker - who wished to reserve power for himself while having his nominees on the throne as mere figure-heads.

4. See pp. 196-198 above.

regarded it as an essential institution evolved in pre-historic times for the efficient protection of human life and for the better realisation of its higher ideals.

The chief function of the king , therefore, is to protect his people. What was the policy adopted by the rulers in ancient Ceylon in performing this duty? Did they follow the Hindu law books or did they prefer the Buddhist principles or was there any special code of indigenous laws? These are questions that we have to consider next.

There was a set of moral laws which the rulers of Ceylon were expected to follow. At the time of their accession to the throne the rulers were advised 'to rule over the land in uprightness, and imbued with the ten royal virtues'.[1] The Cūḷavaṁsa and the epigraphs contain numerous references to ten royal virtues (dasa rājadhamma), i.e., rules of governing, or norms of kingship, but they are not enumerated in either of these works. It was supposed that they were well known to everybody.[2] These virtues are mentioned first in the Jātakas[3] where they

---

1. Vpk., vol. I, p. 304.

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 133.

3. The usual phrase occurs in the Jātaka stories is, dasa rājadhamme akopetva dhammena rajjaṁ kāresi (he ruled in righteousness, not shaking the tenfold virtues of the king), see Jātaka ,Fausböll edition, Jātaka I, p. 260, p. 399; Jātaka II, p. 400; Jātaka III, p. 320; Jātaka V, p. 119, p. 379.

are specified as follows: charity (dāna), morality (sīla), liberality (pariccāga), uprightness (ajjava), impartiality (maddava), self-control (tapo), forgiveness (akkodha), gentleness (avihiṁsā), patience (khanti), humanity (avirodhana).[1] A full illustration of these virtues is found in the Lak Raja Lō Sirita[2] where they are described as thus:

Charity,	viz.,	giving food and clothing to Buddhist monks, Brāhmins and others who live on alms
Piety,	viz.,	constantly maintaining the Buddhist precepts
Liberality,	viz.,	granting fields, gardens and similar valuable gifts
Uprightness,	viz.,	being void of deceit and cunning
Impartiality,	viz.,	dealing with all men alike
Self-control,	viz.,	avoiding the excesses that attend the senses of sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch
Forgiveness,	viz.,	not nourishing feelings of anger

---

1. The ten perfections (dasapāramitā) constitute a similar list of virtues which are more or less identical with the ten qualities of a king (dasarājadhamma). The ten perfections are: charity (dāna), morality (sīla), renunciation (nekkhamma), knowledge (paññā), manliness (viriya), patience (khanti), uprightness (sacca), will-power (adhiṭṭhāna), love (mettā), serenity (upekkhā). These are mentioned in the Pāli literature as the perfect exercise of the ten principal virtues by a Bodhisatta, see Jātaka, I, p. 73; Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (commentary on the Dhammapada), I, p. 84.

2. See appendix III.

Gentleness,	viz.,	not punishing, tormenting or molesting the innocent
Patience,	viz.,	abstaining from condemnation without inquiry
Humanity,	viz.,	absence of enmity towards all beings

All of these attributes indicate that the king is to be a model of ethical probity and morality. By these virtues, the king brings prosperity to his country. There are numerous instances of a virtuous king acting as a rain-maker and causing the parched fields to yield crops.[1] Only if he is himself a paragon of virtue can the king hope to fulfil his most important and almost sacred obligation, that of inculcating dhamma into his subjects. Thus the king accomplishes both by word and by example.

The chronicles always refer to a noble king as having reigned righteously and impartially, practising these ten virtues. The phraseology used by the chronicler to describe the virtues of Buddhadāsa (337-365) illustrates this well: 'gifted with wisdom and virtue, a refuge of pure pity, and endowed with the ten qualities of kings, while avoiding the four wrong paths, practising justice, he (Buddhadāsa) won over his subjects by the

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 74-77; Cv., chap. 37, vv. 189-197.

heart-winning qualities'.[1] Aggabodhi I (571-604) is said to have won over his subjects by the heart-winning qualities and by the royal virtues.[2] The Cūlavaṁsa, in referring to the reign of Sena I (833-853), says: 'endowed with the ten qualities of kings enjoyed the earth (while) performing meritorious works'.[3] Similarly, Moggallāna I (491-508),[4] Silākāla (518-531),[5] Saṁghatissa II (614)[6] and Kassapa V (914-923)[7] are said to have ruled in accordance with these ten virtues (dasa rājadhamma).

The inscriptions of our period also refer to these ten qualities of a king. The Vessagiri Slab Inscription speaks of Mahinda IV (956-972) as 'one who has not transgressed (the rules pertaining to) the ten regal virtues and the four elements of popularity'.[8] Another

---

1. Paññāpuññaguṇūpeto visuddhakaruṇālayo
tathā dasahi rājūnaṁ dhammehi samupāgato
catasso agatī hitvā kārayanto vinicchayaṁ
janaṁ saṁgahavatthūhi saṁgahesi catūhi pi (Cv., chap. 37 vv. 106-108).

2. janaṁ saṁgahavatthūhi rājadhammehi c'aggahi (Cv., chap. 42 v. 7).

3. Cv., chap. 50, v. 62.

4. Cv., chap. 39, v. 33.

5. Cv., chap. 41, v. 27.

6. Cv., chap. 44, v. 1.

7. Cv., chap. 52, v. 43.

8. dasa-rad dham satara saṅg-vat no ikmä (E.Z., vol. I (no. 2), pp. 32-33.).

inscription at Vessagiriya attributes the same virtues to Mahinda IV with the phrase dasa-rad dahamaṭ neves vä 'an abode of the ten kingly virtues'.[1] Frequent references to these ten royal virtues are also found in the inscriptions of the succeeding period.[2] For example, the Polonnaruva Fragmentary Slab Inscription of Sundara Mahādevi says that 'Siri Saṅgabo Vijayabāhu (1055-1110) reigned without violating the ten principles of royal conduct, having brought the whole Island of Laṅkā under one umbrella'.[3] The slab inscription of the Vēḷaikkāras states that Vijayabāhu was graciously pleased to rule the kingdom for fifty-five years practising the ten royal virtues.[4] Every good ruler was thus expected to observe these ten virtues and, apparently, this was in keeping with the Buddhist concept of kingship.

Before proceeding to analyse the significance of this concept of morality associated with the kingship in

---

1. E.Z., vol. I (no. 1), p. 224.

2. The inscriptions of Niśśaṅkamalla also refer to these ten virtues. See the Kāliṅga Park Rock Inscription (E.Z., vol. II, p. 133), Rankot Dāgäba Gal-āsana Inscription (E.Z., vol. II, p. 135) and Prīti-Dānaka-maṇḍapa Rock Inscription (E.Z., vol II, p. 172).

3. . . . dasa rājadharma nokopā mulu Lakdiva eksat kärä rajakaḷa Siri Saṅgbo Vijayabāhu (E.Z., vol. IV, p. 72).

4. E.Z., vol. II, p. 245.

Ceylon, it is important to examine in detail other ideals as well. The rulers were also expected to follow other paths of morality in keeping with the Buddhist code of morals. Thus a king was enjoined to perform day after day the ten meritorious deeds[1] - dasa puñña kiriyā or dasa pinkiriya vat - namely, alms-giving (dāna); morality (sīla); meditation (bhāvanā); reverence (apaciti); diligence (veyyāvacca); transference of one's own merit to another (pattianuppadāna); sharing other's merit (abbhanumodana or pin anumodanā); instruction or preaching the doctrine (desanā or baṇa kīma); hearkening to the doctrine (savana); right views (diṭṭhujukamma).[2]

Occasions on which kings acted in accordance with these morals are also recorded in the chronicle. Of these ten meritorious deeds alms-giving or charitableness comes first. Very often rulers are praised for having supported all their subjects who suffered want or were helpless owing to old age or sickness or to any disaster.[3] Mahinda I (730-733) gave an offering of ten cart-loads to the

---

1. With reference to this life these are the ten qualities contributing to merit, viz., dāna, sīla, bhāvanā etc., 'liberality, morality, meditation'. Of these ten, first three are usually enumerated.

2. D.N., III, p. 218; A.N., IV, p. 241; Itivuttaka, p. 51; Nettippakaraṇa, pp. 50 and 128.

3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 76, chap. 41, v. 66, chap. 44, v. 67, chap. 49, v. 35, chap. 51, v. 85, chap. 60, v. 78.

Mahāpāli hall and provided the beggars with luxuries like his own.[1] Poor people of the higher classes who were ashamed to beg were secretly supported by Mahinda II (777-797), and there were'none in the Island who were not supported by him according to their deserts'.[2] Udaya I (797-801), without annulling ancient charters and observing former decrees, maintained permanently the great alms-giving instituted by his father.[3] Sena I (833-853) is said to have instituted a great alms-giving for needy beggars.[4] Apart from giving alms to the laity, the rulers have provided the Saṅgha with the four requisites (catupaccaya).[5] The Cūlavaṁsa contains numerous references to such donations made to the Saṅgha by the rulers of the period under survey.[6]

Pious kings also took care of animals. In order to provide food for them, they gave to the cattle 'young

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, v. 34.
2. Cv., chap. 48, v. 146.
3. Cv., chap. 49, v. 21.
4. Cv., chap. 50, v. 5.
5. piṇḍapāta (food), cīvara (clothing), senāsana (lodging) and bhesajja (medicine).
6. Cv., chap. 37, v. 76, chap. 41, v. 3, chap. 45, v. 57, chap. 49, v. 30, chap. 51, v. 122.

corn full of milky juice', and rice to the crows and other birds.[1] Mahinda IV (956-972) had rice and cakes distributed to apes, the wild boars, the gazelles and to dogs.[2]

Some rulers have been praised for leading a life of morality observing the eight precepts. 'On the day of the new moon (cātuddasī), on that of the full moon (pañcadasī), and on the eighth day (aṭṭhamī) of each half of the month and on extraordinary festivals', records the Cūlavaṁsa,'he (Upatissa I, 365-406) stayed there accessible to instruction having observed the eight-fold uposatha[3] vow'.[4] Kassapa I (473-491) not only observed the eight Buddhist precepts on uposatha days but also cultivated the appamañña,[5] and took himself the pious

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, v. 147, chap. 49, v. 36.

2. Cv., chap. 54, v. 32; cf. chap. 60, v. 74.

3. Uposatha is the Buddhist sabbath which is kept four times in the lunar month; on the day of the new moon, on that of the full-moon and on the eighth day of each half of the month. On these days the Buddhist lay-devotees observe eight precepts (aṭṭhāṅga-sīla) and spend their time on meditation.

4. Cv., chap. 37, v. 202. Geiger's translation seems to be somewhat incorrect. Cf. Cūlavaṁsa, ed. Sumangala and Batuvantudawe.

5. By appamañña certain virtues are understood which the believing Buddhist practises and which regulate his relations with the outside world. There are four of these (Dhammapada, III, 223 f.): mettā 'a loving spirit', karuṇā 'pity', muditā 'joyous sympathy', upekkhā 'serenity' (Cv., p. 44, n. 8).

dhūtaṅgas[1] (certain ascetic observances). Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667)[2] and Sena III (938-946)[3] are also said to have kept the uposatha vow.

Occasions on which kings preached the doctrine and hearkened to the sermons (desanā and savana) in keeping with the ten meritorious deeds (dasa puñña kiriya), have been recorded in the chronicles as well as other literary works and inscriptions. Moggallāna II (531-551) composed a poem in praise of the Dhamma and recited it at the close of the sermon in the town.[4] Aggabodhi V (718-724) states the Cūḷavaṁsa, 'observed the precepts together with the inhabitants of the Island, and preached to them the doctrine in order to procure them spiritual happiness'.[5] We hear of another ruler who recited the Abhidhamma with

---

1. The dhūtaṅgas are certain ascetic observances of an outward kind thirteen in number. The thirteen dhūtaṅgas are: paṁsukūlika, tecīvarika, piṇḍapātika, sapadāna-cārika, ekāsanika, pattapiṇḍika, khalupacchābhattika, āraññika, rukkhamūlika, abbhokāsika, sosānika, yathā-santhatika and nesajjika. It is not expected that these should be kept simultaneously, but it is meritorious to observe one or the other of them. They are meant primarily for the bhikkhus not for laymen. For details see Visuddhimagga, p. 45 ff.

2. Cv., chap. 45, v. 25.

3. uposathiko yāvajīvaṁ narādhipo (Cv., chap. 53, v. 29).

4. Cv., chap. 41, v. 60. The word Dhamma in these verses means the teaching of Buddha.

5. Uposathaṁ upavasati saddhim dīpajanehi so dhammaṁ ca tesaṁ deseti dātuṁ lokuttaraṁ sukhaṁ (Cv., chap. 48, v. 10).

the grace of a Buddha surrounded by all the bhikkhus and townfolk.[1] The slab inscription of Kassapa V (914-923) refers to the same event when it says: 'He preached that same Dhamma in the presence of his esteemed teacher and extolled the virtues of the Buddha in his own language'.[2]

Another injunction which is included in the ten meritorious deeds (dasa puñña kiriya) is patti[3] (Skt. prāpti) or transference of one's own merit to another. We hear of a few rulers who, according to the Cūḷavaṁsa, carried out this 'meritorious deed'. Jeṭṭhatissa III (628), before committing suicide in battle, sent a high dignitary with a message to the queen entreating her to forsake the world to recite the sacred texts and to transfer the merit to the king.[4] After the death of his son Siddhattha, Kassapa V (914-923) built a splendid hall for the bhikkhus and instituted an offering of alms, transferring to his deceased son the merit thereof.[5] Aggabodhi II

---

1. Buddhalīlāya Laṅkindo abhidhammaṁ abhāsayī (Cv., chap. 52, v. 48). The Abhidhamma is the third part of the Buddhist canon, in which its philosophical content is systematically summarized.

2. . . . ājara hamuyehi eme dham desum viyakhan kaḷa siyabasnen bud guṇa vänū (E.Z., vol. I, p. 43).

3. On the meaning of patti, see J. F. Dickson, J.R.A.S., vol. VIII, no. 29, p. 204.

4. Cv., chap. 44, v. 109.

5. Cv., chap. 52, v. 69.

(604-614) also seems to have fulfilled this 'meritorious act', for it is said in the Cūlavaṁsa that when the royal Thera died, the king performed many meritorious works in his place and for him.[1]

The first of the great precepts strictly to be observed by all Buddhists, by priests as well as by laymen, is the ahiṁsā[2] - the precept not to hurt any living being. As we have pointed out earlier, this is included in the list of ten royal virtues which every good king was expected to follow. Reference has been made to many pious rulers who tried to observe this precept. Silākāla (518-531) decreed throughout the Island preservation of life for all creatures.[3] In the like manner Upatissa II (517-518) established security (of life) for all living creatures.[4] Similarly, Aggabodhi IV (667-683),[5]

---

1. Cv., chap. 42, vv. 49-50; cf. p. 71, n. 6.

2. By ahiṁsā it is meant not killing any being.

3. māghātaṁ kārayī dīpe sabbesaṁ yeva pāṇinaṁ (Cv., chap. 41, v. 30).

4. Cv., chap. 37, v. 193.

5. Cv., chap. 46, v. 3.

Kassapa III (724-730)[1] and Kassapa IV (898-914)[2] prohibited killing on the whole Island by issuing decrees of 'not to slay'.

It is rather difficult to assess to what extent the rulers adhered to this precept. It was the duty of the king to protect his people and to rid his territory of all troubles. The king must punish the wicked and was allowed to use various kinds of punishments to deter potential offenders. In this punitive task the king was given absolute powers to the extent of executing the convicted criminals. Upatissa II (517-518) was one of the few rulers who, according to the Cūlavaṁsa, established security of life for all living creatures,[3] but he, too, had not refrained from punishing wrong-doers. It is said in the Cūlavaṁsa that once on seeing a criminal who was being led for execution, Upatissa was deeply moved. He therefore thought of a means of saving the criminal and had a corpse fetched from the burial grounds which he caused to be thrown into a copper barrel. He

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, v. 23.
2. Cv., chap. 52, v. 15.
3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 193.

then gave the criminal money and let him escape by night. But after sunrise, he pretended to be full of wrath and had the corpse burnt so as to give the impression to the people that the criminal's body was being burnt.[1] Although it is said that Upatissa II finally freed the criminal, he himself must have been responsible for seeing to the implementation of the death penalty on him. According to the law which existed in those days the ultimate decision in a charge involving the punishment of death vested in the king.[2] Moreover, none of the rulers mentioned above is said to have refrained from war or disbanded their armies in order to be true adherents of this precept.

The Buddha himself admits the difficulty of ruling without the use of force in any manner and under all circumstances,[3] and the history of Buddhist kingship in Ceylon and elsewhere shows as much use of force in internal and external relations as in other systems. Nor is it known that the Buddha advised total disarmament by a state. One measure that the Buddha took in expressing his disapproval of the institution of war was to forbid the

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 205-207.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 230; see also Lak Raja Lō Sirita, British Museum, palm-leaf MS., OR 6603(65)665.

3. Saṁyutta Nikāya, I, p. 116.

monks from witnessing army parades and reviews.[1] In spite of these seeming compromises in practice, early Buddhist political thought insists on the principle of non-violence and non-injury as the ideal basis of state-craft and hopes to minimize the force inherent in the power of the state by ordaining that this power be, at all times, restrained by morality.

There were two other sets of virtues that kings were expected to follow, namely, avoidance of evil conduct caused by the four kinds of error (P. catasso agati, Sinh. satara agati), and practice of the four heart-winning qualities (P. cattāri saṁgahavatthūni, Sinh. siv-saňgarā-vat).[2] The rulers were admonished to refrain from wrong-ful conduct caused by any of the four errors - desire (chanda), malice (dosa), fear (bhaya) and delusion (moha) - for it is stated that the glory of those who do not trans-gress the path of righteousness grows like the waxing moon.[3] Moreover, it was considered necessary for the

---

1. D.N., (P.T.S.), I, PP. 7-8.

2. The cattāri saṁgahavatthūni are mentioned frequently in Pāli literature, D.N., III, pp. 152, 232; A.N., II, p. 32, p. 248, IV, p. 219, p. 364; Jātaka, V, p. 330; Paramatthajotikā, p. 236, p. 240.

3. chando dosā bhayā mohā yo dhammaṁ nātivattati vaḍḍhati tassa yaso sukkha-pakkeva candimā (D.N., IV, p. 182).

rulers to practise the four heart-winning qualities, namely, liberality (dāna), friendly speech (peyyavajja), beneficence (atthacariyā) and impartiality (samānattatā) in order to win the goodwill of their subjects. Buddhadāsa (337-365), while avoiding the four wrong paths (catasso agati) and practising justice, won over his subjects by the four heart-winning qualities.[1] Moggallāna II (531-551) won over the mass of his subjects by largesse, friendly speech, by working for the good of others, and by his natural feelings for others.[2] Carrying on the government with the ten (royal) virtues and with the four means of winning hearts, Kassapa V protected the world as an only son of his own.[3] Aggabodhi I (571-604) is also said to have won over his subjects by the heart-winning qualities and by the royal virtues.[4] In like manner Upatissa II (517-518),[5] Kassapa III (724-730)[6] and Udaya I (797-801)[7]

---

1. catasso agatī hitvā kārayanto vinicchayaṁ janaṁ saṁgahavatthūhi saṁgehi catūhi pi (Cv., chap. 37, v. 108).
2. Cv., chap. 41, v. 56.
3. Cv., chap. 52, v. 43.
4. Cv., chap. 42, v. 7.
5. Cv., chap. 37, v. 181.
6. Cv., chap. 48, v. 21.
7. Cv., chap. 49, v. 4.

won the goodwill of their subjects by fulfilling the four heart-winning qualities. The foregoing evidence would thus make it clear that these were the ideals set before every ruler who ascended the throne of Laṅkā.[1]

The traditional laws that the rulers of the Island were bound to conform are explicitly stated in the Lak Raja Lō Sirita.[2] This is a catachism on the traditional laws and customs of the country and its rulers. Although this work has been composed in 1769 A.D., it refers not only to the conditions of its day but also to the traditions and customs of the country existing from ancient times.

---

1. Niśśaṅkamalla (1187-1196) in his records has made frequent references to all these precepts of ruling. The Galpota Slab Inscription records that 'in this manner he conciliated the world and the religion (lokasāsana) by the exercise of the fourfold cardinal virtues and reached the very summit of popularity . . . . performing day after day the ten meritorious acts' (E.Z., vol. II, p. 118). Similarly there is ample reference to the ten principles of royal conduct (dasarājadhamma) in his records (E.Z., vol. II, p. 125, p. 133, p. 157, p. 17[illegible] It is of importance that Niśśaṅkamalla tried to convince his subjects by pointing out that he had been ruling in accordance with these ideals because it reveals the fact that these concepts were established in the country as ideals of a good ruler. Moreover, we should not forget the fact that Niśśaṅkamalla ascended the throne at a time when there was political confusion in the country and that his aim was to win the goodwill of his subjects. Therefore, he would not have referred to the above concepts if they were not upheld by the people as ideals of a good ruler.

2. The only work extant of this nature.

Moreover, the principles which guided the later kings seem to be in accordance with the lex non scripta of the country or such customary laws dating from a remote antiquity. The native rulers who reigned at Kotte and Kandy during the time that the Portuguese and Dutch exercised their sway over the maritime parts of the Island, seem to have governed the interior provinces upon the basis of the constitution and laws derived from their ancestors who ruled in such cities as Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva.[1] The Cūlavaṁsa explains this remarkably when it says that 'When Kīrtisrī Rājasiṁha heard of the doings of former kings, of Parākramabāhu and others, he recognised it as right and imitated their doings. He learned the duties of a king, was filled with reverence for kingly duties, shunned the four false paths and schooled himself in the four heart-winning qualities'.[2] Therefore, the Lak Raja Lō Sirita, though composed at a later date, can be utilized for our period as well. According to this work, one of the established laws that the king is bound to conform is to gain victory over the five-fold senses,[3] namely, sight, hearing, smell, taste

---

1. A. De S. Ekanayake, 'On the form of Government under the Native Sovereigns of Ceylon', J.R.A.S., n.s., vol. VIII, p. 297.

2. Cv., chap. 99, v. 73.

3. rūpa, sadda, gandha, rasa and phoṭṭabba.

and touch.[1] The king is also expected to practise the ten royal virtues[2] existing from earliest times. Moreover, it says that this system of conduct which a king ought to observe, was preached by the Buddha to the Licchavi rulers when the Buddha was residing in Vesāli. The Lak Raja Lō Sirita also names another ten ordinances the rulers are bound to conform: that the king shall not forsake the religion of the Buddha and embrace a different religion; that he shall not kill the Queen Mother or the Royal Father; that he shall not put to death any pious member of the Saṅgha; that he shall not injure sacred Bo trees (ficus religiosa) nor deface any temple or stūpa containing the images or relics of the Buddha; that he shall not deprive any animal of life; that he shall not commit theft or adultery; that he shall not utter a falsehood or drink intoxicating liquors.[3] The exemplary character expected of a king is also described in the Butsaraṇa[4] and in the

---

1. See appendix III for details.

2. See pp. 203-205 above.

3. See appendix III.

4. 'The prosperity or the disasters of the world are caused by the righteousness or the wickedness of kings. When kings are righteous, the gods who are their protectors and all others become righteous. The Sun and the Moon move in their fixed courses when kings act according to right conduct. Just like the life force which protects all forms that have arisen due to the laws of karma, the

story of Kāvantissa in the Saddharmālaṁkāraya.[1]

From the evidence we have so far given, it becomes clear that the standard of conduct set up for a king was a very noble one, and consisted in strenuous exertion for the welfare of his subjects. The chroniclers have thus tried to depict the career of the rulers of this period as full of moral activities. Again and again it has been said in praise of many rulers that in their actions they followed former kings and, that they did not deviate from the path of tradition or custom of the land.[2] There were, nevertheless, many rulers who deviated from this path to a greater or lesser extent. The few rulers who are praised for their moral activities can be exceptions rather than

---

protection of all beings is dependent on kings. . . . Our sovereigns are of noble lineage, are possessed of good fortune, intellect and truthfulness; they guide their policy in accordance with the counsel of those mature in wisdom, are just, speak the truth, are not contradictory in policy, are grateful, attach importance to a modicum of worthiness in a person in the midst of many unworthy qualities, are energetic, are skilful in the attainment of objectives that are desired, have ministers who carry out what they have been instructed to do, have subdued their senses and are not lacking in any virtues that are expected of kings' (Butsarana, p. 169, trans. in U.H.C., vol. I, pt. II, p. 533).

1. Saddharmālaṁkāraya, ed. B. Saddhatissa, p. 452.

2. cariyaṁ pubbarājūnaṁ samācari yathābhataṁ (Cv., chap. 42, v. 12; chap. 48, v. 20; chap. 50, v. 2; chap. 44, v. 85; chap. 49, v. 40, v. 66; chap. 53, v. 2, v. 27).

the rule. Most rulers of this period gained power by overthrowing the ruling monarch.[1] One ruler went to the extent of killing his father and/a few others killed their own brothers for the sake of power. Kassapa I (473-491) came to power by putting his father to death[2] and Moggallāna I (491-508) made his brother commit suicide in a struggle between them for power.[3] Mahānāma (406-428) became king as a result of an intrigue he had with the queen of his brother.[4] After Dāṭhāpabhuti (531) had seized the throne he had his brother (Upatissa) murdered.[5] Such actions on the part of these rulers showed that for the sake of power they ignored the accepted ideals of a good king. But even these rulers attempted in other areas of activities to live up to these ideals, such as by building religious edifices, bestowing alms or constructing irrigation works. It is noteworthy that the chronicler

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 209-210; chap. 38, vv. 84-111; chap. 41, v. 5; chap. 41, v. 6, vv. 10-25, v. 42, v. 91; chap. 44, v. 64.

2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 84-112.

3. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 20-28.

4. The queen murdered the king by stabbing him in a lonely spot and helped Mahānāma to acquire power (Cv., chap. 37, vv. 209-210).

5. Cv., chap. 41, v. 42.

has praised even the parricide Kassapa for upholding some of these moral precepts.[1]

The evidence we have cited above concerning the ideals or moral precepts is of importance for two reasons. Firstly, these evidence points out that the rulers of Ceylon were expected to fall into line with the order of morality set forth by the Buddha,[2] and also to practise the virtues demanded of every Buddhist lay devotee. If the king follows these prescriptions as a rule of conduct, this necessarily takes much from his character as an absolute despot. Secondly, they reveal the concepts that prevailed in the country concerning good government.

The other important factor is that the ideals recommended for the rulers of Ceylon represent nothing else but the path of righteousness prescribed by Buddhist

---

1. Cv., chap. 39, v. 18.

2. We can imagine what influence Buddhism had on the rulers when we think of a king like Mahācūli Mahātissa (77-63 B.C.) who worked like a labourer on account of religious devotion. Mahācūli Mahātissa, who had heard that alms-giving out of things earned by the sweat of one's brow was highly meritorious, worked in disguise in a paddy field, and with the rice he earned as his wages gave alms to Mahāsumma Thera. Again he worked disguised as a labourer in a sugar-mill, and the lumps of sugar he earned as his wages he offered to the Saṅgha (Mv., chap. XXXIV, vv. 2-5).

theorists in the Jātakas and other canonical works. This would become clear by a comparison of ideas in the Cūḷavaṁsa and Jātakas. In a number of Jātakas[1] it is said that kings ruled in righteousness, that they shunned the four wrong courses of life,[2] that they practised the ten royal duties[3] and that they won over the people by the four elements of popularity. We have seen above that the same ideas were expressed in the Cūḷavaṁsa and inscriptions concerning the conduct of a king. The king, we are further told in the Jātakas, should apply himself to the promotion of universal happiness of his subjects. Righteousness is the essence of kingship as well as the king's best policy. An extension of the concept of the righteousness (dhamma) of the king is the idea that the king is personally responsible for the conditions in his country. If misfortune is rife, the king has to obviate it by his personal rectitude and virtue.[4] The king is therefore advised to follow the path of righteousness

---

1. Jātaka, I, p. 260; II, p. 118; III, pp. 325, 470; V, p. 378.
2. See p. 216 above.
3. See pp. 203-205 above.
4. Ratilal Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, p. 84.

because the people follow the king as a herd of cattle follow the bull, and the whole realm enjoys weal or woe whether the king rules righteously or otherwise. When the king becomes unrighteous, the people follow him and the whole realm comes to grief, while in the contrary case the people equally follow the king's example and the whole realm enjoys happiness.[1] In referring to the reign of Aggabodhi IV (667-683), the Cūlavaṁsa expresses the same view: 'Many people erected vihāras emulating the king, thus people became righteous, for it is the rule with living creatures: what he who is master does, evil or good, the same is done by his subjects; let the wise man take heed of that'.[2] A similar idea is met with again in the chronicle when it says that 'everyone in his (Aggabodhi V, 718-724) kingdom performed good deeds leading to heaven, for as the monarch acts so do also his subjects'.[3] Thus, from the above analysis it would become clear that the Jātaka concepts echo in the chronicles of Ceylon. Hence, on the basis of this similarity between political ideals

---

1. Jātaka, III, p. 111; V, pp. 222, 242.

2. aññe su bahavo'kaṁsu vihāre evamādike
tassa raññō'nuvattantā evaṁ dhammī hi pāṇino
pāpaṁ vā pi hi puññaṁ vā padhāno yaṁ karotiyo
loko taṁ taṁ karot'eva, taṁ vijāneyya paṇḍito (Cv., chap. 46, vv. 25-26).

3. yaṁ karoti mahīpālo taṁ tassa kurute jano (Cv., chap. 48, vv. 11-15).

of the early Buddhist theorists and those mentioned in the chronicles, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the kings of early medieval Ceylon followed the Buddhist political tradition rather than that laid down by Hindu theorists. This does not necessarily imply that the kings of our period did not have any knowledge of the Hindu law. It is quite likely that the rulers of this period were conversant with Hindu law books and were to some extent influenced by them especially with regard to warfare. Neither the Cūḷavaṁsa nor any other Buddhist text contains any details concerning warfare. Therefore, it is quite likely that the kings of our period, too, like their successors[1] consulted the works of Hindu theorists at least regarding the methods and tactics of war.

With the spread of Buddhism the teachings of Buddha came to be not without influence upon the conduct of kings of Laṅkā. As a consequence, a close relationship

---

1. The rulers of the Polonnaru period have followed such law books. Before the beginning of the war against Rājaraṭṭha, Parākramabāhu I is said to have worked out the plan of campaign with ingenuity in a way suited to the locality and the time. He did so by a careful study of literary works useful in making war, such as the text book of Koṭalla, i.e., the Arthaśāstra and the Yuddhaṇṇava (Cv., chap. 70, vv. 56-57).

developed between the king and the Saṅgha.[1] The Saṅgha came to the scene as advisers of rulers not only in spiritual/affairs but also on political problems.[2] They had access to the king and his chief officers and were consulted on important affairs of the state.[3] They also functioned as peace-makers on several occasions when conflicts arose among members of the royal family.[4] Therefore this close relationship with the Saṅgha may also have induced the rulers to conduct their internal policy in accordance with the Buddhist principles or concepts of dhamma.

Moreover, the doctrine that the king of Ceylon should necessarily be a Buddhist[5] may also have had some influence on the rulers in inducing them to abide by Buddhist principles. Devānampiya Tissa's request to thera Mahinda to establish the sīma (boundary) so as to include the city in order that the king would live 'within the Buddha's command'[6] is significant. From that day in the

---

1. For a detailed discussion see pp 237-293 below.

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 130; see also pp. 248-254 below.

3. Mv., chap. XXXIII, vv. 17-18; Cv., chap. 60, v. 87; for details see pp. 252-254 below.

4. Mv., chap. XXXIII, vv. 73-77; Cv., chap. 51, vv. 13-14; chap. 52, v. 9; see pp. 243-246 below.

5. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. II, p. 532.

6. Mv., chap. XV, vv. 182-183.

third century B.C. to the end of the Sinhalese rule in the nineteenth century A.D.,[1] only a Buddhist seems to have had the legitimate right to be king of Ceylon. By about the tenth century, this belief seems to have become very strong as is evidenced by the proclamation made by Mahinda IV (956-972) in his Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription. In this record the king speaks of the rulers of his dynasty as 'the Kṣatriya lords devoted to the Buddha, who of yore have received the assurance made by the omniscient Lord of Sages, the pinnacle of the Śākya race, that none but Bodhisattvas would become kings of prosperous Laṅkā'.[2] It would thus appear that kings of Ceylon had not only to be Buddhists; but also to live up to Bodhisattva ideals.[3]

Niśśaṅkamalla (1187-1196) says in his inscriptions that Laṅkā belongs to Buddhism and that, therefore, non-Buddhists like Coḷas and Keraḷas have no right to the

---

1. John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants, p. 105.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 237.

3. Bodhisattva is the name given to a being that makes a solemn vow to follow the path leading to Bodhi or Enlightenment. A Bodhisattva passes through many existences and many stages of progress before the last birth in which he fulfils his great destiny. According to the definition given in the commentaries (Bodhisatto ti paṇḍitasatto bujjhanakasatto; bodhisaṅkhātesu vā catusu maggesu āsatto laggamānaso ti Bodhisatto [Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II, p. 427; Manorathapūraṇī, I, p. 453]), the word may

throne of Ceylon.[1] The Pūjāvaliya, a Sinhalese prose work of the 13th century, expresses this idea more explicitly:

> This Island of Laṅkā belongs to the Buddha himself; . . . Even if a non-Buddhist ruled Ceylon by force for a while, it is a particular power of the Buddha that his line will not be established. Therefore, as Laṅkā is suitable only for Buddhist kings, it is certain that their lines, too, will be established.[2]

Now the question may be asked why this theory - that the king of Ceylon should be a Buddhist - was not mentioned in the records of our period, and this may be explained in a different way. During our period it may not have been considered necessary to refer to this tradition as it was well-known to the people of its day, and also there was no political necessity to lay down such a rule. But, on the other hand, it became very essential to remind people again and again of this theory in the succeeding period because of the unsettled political situation. The reason why Niśśaṅkamalla has made frequent references to this theory would become clear when we take into consideration the political factors in force at the time of his

---

be used with reference to all those who seek Nibbāna, including Buddhas, Pacceka-Buddhas, and the disciples of the Buddha; but it is commonly used only of those beings who seek to become Buddhas.

1. E.Z., vol. II, pp. 109, 159.

2. Pūjāvaliya, p. 656.

accession.[1] There were non-Buddhists like the Coḷas and Pāṇḍyas who were vying for the throne and it is likely that they also had a group of supporters. Hence, under these circumstances it may have become necessary to draw the attention of the people to the well-established traditions of the Island. The passage in the Pūjāvaliya is a similar reaction against the increasing power of the non-Buddhists (Pāṇḍyas) in the country.

The rule that the king of Laṅkā should be a Buddhist seems to have taken firm root during the period under survey. Although it is not specifically stated anywhere, it appears that almost all the rulers of our period, except for some foreign invaders and usurpers, were Buddhists.[2] This supposition gains some measure of support by the fact that most of these rulers have abided by the Buddhist morals set forth by the Buddha. For example, Upatissa I (365-406),[3] Kassapa I (473-491),[4] Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667),[5] Aggabodhi V

---

1. E.Z., vol. II, p. 101.

2. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, 'The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965), pp. 242-243.

3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 203.

4. Cv., chap. 39, v. 18.

5. Cv., chap. 45, v. 25.

(718-724)[1] and Sena III (938-946)[2] are said to have observed the eight-fold uposatha vow, i.e., that they kept the eight Buddhist moral commands on uposatha days - an act which could be expected only from a Buddhist. We also find some indirect evidence in the Cūḷavaṁsa which help to decide the religion of a ruler. It is said of Kassapa V (914-923): 'standing firmly in the teachings of the Buddha, not to be shaken by all the storms of other opinions'.[3] The Cūḷavaṁsa records that Mahinda IV, after listening to the doctrine, was established in the Sāsana of the Buddha.[4] Moreover, the enormous benefactions made on the Dhamma (doctrine) and the Saṅgha could be expected only from Buddhist rulers.[5] It is interesting to note here that even some foreign rulers of this period tried to uphold

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, v. 10.

2. Cv., chap. 53, v. 29.

3. acalo indakhīlo va ṭhito sugatasāsane parappavādivātehi sabbehi pi akampiyo (Cv., chap. 52, v. 4

4. dhammaṁ sutvāna so rājā pasanno Buddhasāsane (Cv., chap. 54, v. 17). Cf. E.Z., vol. I, p. 224, lines 5-7.

5. Cv., chap. 37, v. 96, v. 98; chap. 38, v. 45; chap. 37, v. 213; chap. 41, v. 98; chap. 42, v. 9; chap. 46, v. 9. It should be noted, however, that the rulers' active interest in and deep devotion to Buddhism did not result in the disparagement of Hinduism or any other religion. On the contrary, most of them honoured Brāhmins and rendered them material help (Cv., chap. 48, v. 23; chap. 50, v. 5; chap. 51, v. 65).

this tradition. The invasion of Paṇḍu towards the end of the fifth century imposed foreign rule on the Island for a little over a quarter of a century.[1] Six Tamils ruled in succession till the last of them was overpowered by Dhātusena. It is noteworthy that at least three of these rulers acted as patrons of Buddhism. The inscription of Pārinda at Aragama, in the Kuruṇāgala District, records donations made by him to a Buddhist monastery.[2] The benefactions made by the queen of Khuddapārinda to a Buddhist monastery have been recorded in another inscription where the king himself is given the epithet of 'Buddhadāsa' (servant of Buddha).[3] Paranavitana has identified Mahadaḷi Mahana (P. Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga) and his father Sarataraya (P. Sirīdhara) mentioned in an inscription at Kataragama with the Tamil rulers Dāṭhiya and Tirītara respectively.[4] If this identification is correct, Dāṭhiya also appears to have been a ruler who patronized the religion of the country. Dāṭhiya or Mahadaḷi Mahana is represented in

---

1. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 292.

2. C.J.Sc., Section G, vol. II, p. 181.

3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 114.

4. Paranavitana has given very plausible reasons for the identification of the rulers of the Kataragama inscription with the Tamil kings mentioned in the Cūḷavaṁsa, see C.J.Sc., section G, II, pp. 181-182.

this inscription as making gifts to the Maṁgala Mahācetiya at Kataragama.[1] The chronicles do not contain any evidence either to the faith of these rulers, or to the monasteries that benefited by their donations, but the inscriptions which record these benefactions to Buddhist monasteries afford evidence of the fact that they supported the Buddhist religion. Hence, it is quite likely that, even though they themselves were not ardent followers of the Buddhist faith, they tried to safeguard the traditions upheld in the country, i. e., that the ruler of Laṅkā should be a Buddhist and protector of the Sāsana.[2] On the other hand, it could be argued that they supported the religion as a matter of political expediency in order to win the favour of the people. But the fact that it was necessary to act as patrons of Buddhism in order to win the goodwill of the people itself proves that the people expected their rulers

---

1. Paranavitana makes the following observations on this record: 'As the epigraph is fragmentary, we cannot say exactly what its contents were, but from such parts as have been preserved, it seems that its purport was to register a grant of land made for defraying the expenses connected with the ritual at the Maṁgala Mahācetiya at Kataragama, which doubtless is the modern Kirivehera' (E.Z., vol. III, pp. 216-218).

2. E.Z., vol. II, p. 253.

to be Buddhists. According to the Lak Raja Lō Sirita, the first rule that kings of Ceylon are bound to conform is that they should not give up Buddhism and embrace another religion.[1] Therefore, the influence of the Saṅgha on/the one hand, and the doctrine that kings should be Buddhists on the other, undoubtedly had a considerable effect on the conduct of the rulers of the Island.

Therefore, on the strength of the evidence so far given we are perhaps justified in assuming that the rulers of early Ceylon were expected to build up their governing policy in accordance with the concept of Dhamma as laid down in the early Buddhist texts. In other words, the institution of kingship in Ceylon has developed as a Buddhist institution following closely the theories expounded by Buddhist theorists. According to Buddhist views on kingship, a good king is expected to be charitable,

---

1. See appendix III. That this belief was prevalent even as late as the 19th century can be seen from the 'Kandyan Convention of 1815'. When the Kandyan kingdom was ceded to the British in 1815, a convention was signed between the British government and the Kandyan chiefs and headmen. Article five of this agreement was 'that the religion of the Budhoo (Buddha) professed by the chiefs and inhabitants of the provinces is declared inviolable, and its rights and ministers and places of worship are to be maintained and protected' (Kandyan Convention of 2nd March 1815 [PRO/CO/54/61]).

moral, sacrificing, just, humble, penitent, non-wrathful, non-violent and harmless.[1] In brief, the ideal king should be pre-eminently a moral being. A good king, according to Buddhist views, should also observe the traditions of attha and dhamma.[2] The terms attha and dhamma may be rendered in our present context as actions conducive to prosperity and righteousness .[3] It is in the concept of dhamma that the Buddhist ideas on kingship find their ultimate conclusion. In fact the Buddhist ideal ruler, the Cakkavatti, is often called 'dhammiko dhammarājā'.[4] At least two rulers of our period are said to have borne this title. Aggabodhi IV (667-683) was given the title Dhammarāja[5] and Mahinda III (801-804) was known by the name of Dhammika Silāmegha.[6] In another text dhamma is declared to be the ruler of rulers, the highest in the world.[7] 'The Buddhist king seems to

---

1. Jātaka, III, p. 274; Saṁyutta Nikāya, I, p. 222.

2. Dīgha Nikāya, III, p. 61.

3. See T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede, Pali Dictionary, pp. 23, 335, 339.

4. A.N., I, pp. 109-110. Cf. also Balkrishna G. Gokhale, 'Dhammiko Dhammarājā', Indica (1953), pp. 161-165.

5. Cv., chap. 46, v. 2.

6. Cv., chap. 49, v. 39.

7. A.N., III, p. 151; D.N., III, p. 95.

represent the cosmic organization of mystic and spiritual power. He is no regal warrior; his is the power of the prayer wheel rather than that of the sword. Of course he wages war upon occasion, but his is the war for the dhamma. And he must also chastise and punish his subjects upon occasion, but recourse to force shows a flaw in his own merit, and is therefore used with extreme caution. He rules instead with his merit, and with the organized speakers of the word of the Buddha, the Saṅgha. He rules by example; he is the lamp which lights the way to righteousness'.[1] The rulers of Ceylon were also expected to follow this path of righteousness of a Buddhist ruler as is evidenced by the ideals that we have discussed above.

The Buddhist influence is thus reflected on the institution of kingship in early/medieval Ceylon. It is accepted that the civilization of the Island took a new course with the introduction of Buddhism in the 3rd century B.C., and that in spite of invasions from South India and other external influences it was Buddhism that moulded almost every aspect of the culture of the Island throughout the entire Anurādhapura period. And, as we have seen, this is particularly the case with the political institutions of the period under survey.

---

1. Jayashree B. Gokhale, 'Hindu and Buddhist Political Traditions', Journal of Indian History, vol. XLIX (1971), p. 216.

CHAPTER VI

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE KING AND THE SAṄGHA

> The early Buddhist thinking on the nature and functions of the state passed through three distinct phases. In the third and final phase the Buddhists explicate their own ideal of the state in which the state simply becomes an instrument of the Dhamma which now assumes the form of a cosmic force capable not only of containing the challenge of the power of the state but also regulating its behaviour. In this sense the state becomes an ethical institution drawing its authority from the Dhamma and guided by its repository, the Saṅgha.[1]

A survey of the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha would reveal the impact of these views on the institution of kingship in Ceylon.

In order to understand and assess the importance of relationship between the king and the Saṅgha, it is necessary to have, in the first place, a general idea of

---

1. The initial phase is contained in the theory on the origin of the state as given in the Mahāsammata story of the Dīgha Nikāya. The second stage is concerned with the problem of relationships between Buddhism and a well-entrenched and all powerful monarchical despotism and the solution is proposed in the theory of two equal spheres of life, one, that of the Dhamma and the other, āṇā (Balkrishna Govind Gokhale, 'The Early Buddhist View of the State', J.A.O.S., 89. 4 (1969) p. 731).

the religious background of the period. The division of the community of monks into three nikāyas[1] led by three major monasteries at Anurādhapura - the Mahāvihāra, the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana - had become, by this period, a characteristic feature of the structure and the organization of the Sinhalese Saṅgha. For about a century and a half after the introduction of Buddhism, the community of monks in the Island acknowledged the authority of the Mahāvihāra, the great monastery founded by Devānampiya Tissa at Anurādhapura. But, in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī the inmates of the Abhayagiri monastery founded by that king, seceded from the Mahāvihāra and formed an independent organization of their own. Later on, another faction broke away from the community at the Abhayagiri monastery and went to live at Dakkhiṇārāma. Thus arose the three sects (nikāyas) into which the Sinhalese Saṅgha was divided in ancient Ceylon.[2]

The Mahāvihāra, the original centre of Buddhism in Ceylon, remained the leading centre of the orthodox

---

1. The term nikāya here denotes three rival groupings of monks, following different interpretation of the Buddhist scriptures.

2. Vpk., vol. I, pp. 175-176; Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, pp. 12-15; R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, 'The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965), pp. 17-18.

fraternity. The inmates of this monastery had enjoyed the undivided regard and respect, loyalty and support of the king and the people and did not like new elements entering the field to share their privileges and dividing the attention. But it was not possible to suppress new developments, which were the natural outcome of various changes, social, political and economic. The Mahāvihāra suffered its first blow in the reign of Mahāsena (274-301) who razed some of its buildings to the ground, forbade the people to give alms to its members and built within its precincts a monastery for the Sāgalikas.[1] But when Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328), Mahāsena's successor, came to power, he made amends for the wrong suffered by the Mahāvihāra at the hands of his father,[2] and that fraternity lost no time in recovering the position it enjoyed before being subjected to prosecution.

The Abhayagiri monastery flourished under the patronage of many rulers. The chronicles as well as the inscriptions testify to the extensive patronage that the Abhayagiri monastery enjoyed during this period.[3] The

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXVII, vv. 4-9.

2. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 61-65.

3. Cv., chap. 50, v. 68, v. 77, vv. 83-84, chap. 51, v. 77, chap. 52, v. 13; Pūjāvaliya, p. 103; Cv., chap. 52, v. 58, chap. 53, v. 33; E.Z., vol. I, p. 221.

liberal attitude towards the teachings of the non-Theravada schools of Buddhism would have helped this monastery to gain adherents and flourish as the main monastery of a prominent section of the Buddhist community. According to Fa-hsien, who visited Ceylon in the fifth century, there were five thousand monks living at the Abhayagiri monastery as against the three thousand at the Mahāvihāra.[1]

The Jetavana monastery,[2] which is renowned for its stūpa, was built in the reign of Mahāsena. Little evidence is available on the Jetavana fraternity. From what little is known, it appears that its influence was more restricted than that of the other two.[3]

The rulers of our period appear to have extended their patronage to all the three nikāyas (fraternities). Soon after his victory, Moggallāna I (491-508) paid his respects to the community of monks at the Mahāvihāra by presenting them with the royal umbrella,[4] and showed his allegiance to the other two fraternities by granting them monasteries.[5] Mahānāga (569-571) is said to have repaired

---

1. S. Beal, Chinese Accounts of India, pp. 46-47.

2. For a discussion on the identification of the three monasteries, see H. Parker, Ancient Ceylon, pp. 291-311.

3. For a detailed discussion on the three monasteries, see R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 18-39.

4. Cv., chap. 39, v. 31.

5. Cv., chap. 39, v. 41.

the three great cetiyas and made gifts of cloth to the three fraternities.[1] Aggabodhi IV (667-683) made benefactions to the three fraternities: 'To the three fraternities he gave a thousand villages with large and assured revenues'.[2] Udaya II (887-898) had rice with sour milk distributed among the inmates of the three sects.[3] Similarly, Jeṭṭhatissa III (628), Kassapa IV (898-914), Kassapa V (914-923), Sena III (938-946), Sena IV (954-956) and Mahinda IV (956-972)[4] are said to have patronized the three fraternities. Yet there may have been a few rulers who showed particular favour to one or two of the three fraternities. Aggabodhi II (604-614) does not seem to have taken much interest in the activities of the Mahāvihāra.[5] Instead, he extended his lavish patronage to the other two fraternities. His queen, on the other hand, was in sympathy with the Abhayagiri monastery.[6] Dāṭhopatiss

---

1. Cv., chap. 41, vv. 95, 97.
2. Cv., chap. 46, vv. 6-16.
3. Cv., chap. 51, v. 133.
4. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 96-97; chap. 52, vv. 12, 35; chap. 52, vv. 45, 57-59; chap. 53, v. 37; chap. 54, v. 5; chap. 54, vv. 33, 54.
5. Cv., chap. 42, vv. 51-56.
6. Cv., chap. 42, v. 43, vv. 64-66.

II (659-667) also seems to have had a predilection for the Abhayagiri monastery. He built the vihāra called Tiputthulla within the boundaries of the Mahāvihāra and granted it to the Abhayagiri monastery. Although the bhikkhus of the Mahāvihāra were opposed to this act, the king carried it through by force.[1]

The monastery of this period was not merely a 'place of residence' for monks; it also represented an institution which possessed a considerable extent of land[2] and an administrative organization to control its property and its tenants. Royal endowments and private donations made the monasteries the most affluent institutions in the Island. The monastery which originated as a 'leaf-hut' (paṇṇasālā)[3] had become by about the sixth century a wealthy land-owning institution. The rulers of this period not only granted lands but also attached several immunities to most of the lands belonging to the monasteries.[4] This resulted in a substantial addition to the resources of the monastery as well as to its power. The practice of

---

1. Cv., chap. 45, vv. 29-30.
2. See pp. 257-259 below.
3. Walpola Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p. 114.
4. See R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 261-280.

granting lands, fields, tanks, salterns, royal dues[1] and immunities to the monasteries brought about significant changes in the life of the Saṅgha and the administration of the monasteries.[2] As institutions which owned extensive agricultural resources and controlled many types of labour, the monasteries of this period were deeply involved in the economic life of the people. These economic interests of the Saṅgha provide a valuable clue to the understanding of their relations with the laity, particularly with the king.

A very close relationship seems to have existed between the Saṅgha and the rulers of this period. The part played by the Saṅgha in the affairs of the king may be examined first. Often members of the Saṅgha acted as guardians and mediators when any conflict had arisen within the royal family or at court. The accomplishment of monks in the sphere of learning and their acquaintance with belles lettres helped them to gain a leading position in society. They were respected and praised for their learning. In addition, the Saṅgha occupied a position

---

1. See p. 257 below.

2. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 131-194.

of prestige and honour in society. In his enumeration of the privileges and advantages of clerical life, the author of the Pūjāvaliya, himself a monk, refers to the immunity from being harassed by royal officers who toured the country to collect taxes. He also points out that a monk is not obliged to rise from his seat on seeing the king, the heir-apparent or a minister; he could remain seated without fear of punishment.[1] This respectable and influential position that the monks held in society suited them to the role of mediators among kings as well as commoners. A ruler of the first century declared 'As long as I live, judgments given by Ābhidhammika Godatta Thera, in cases either of monks or laymen, are final. I will punish him who does not abide by his judgment'.[2] There were occasions when disputes regarding lands belonging to laymen were referred to the Saṅgha for settlement.[3] In like manner the Saṅgha had access to the king and other members of the

---

1. raja yuvaraja maha ämatiyan duṭu kala bhaya nätiva hunasnen nonäṅgī hiṅdīma satvana suva viṅdīmaya (Pūjāvaliya, ed. Bentota Saddhatissa, p. 22).

2. Mayi sante bhikkhūnampi bhikkhunīnampi gihīnampi adhikaraṇam Ābhidhammika-Godattattherena vinicchitaṁ suvinicchitaṁ (Samantapāsādika, (S.H.B.), p. 221). This does not necessarily mean that the above thera acted in the capacity of a judge implementing punishment on the wrongdoers. He may have played the role of a 'Justice of the Peace' among the clerics as well as the laity.

3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 87.

royal family. Even as early as the second century B.C., Duṭṭhagāmaṇī's brother, Tissa, when defeated in battle, went to Mahāgāma with the thera Godhagatta Tissa who succeeded in reconciling the king with his brother.[1] The theras Tissa and Mahātissa reconciled Vaṭṭagāmaṇi with his highest dignitaries who had deserted him.[2] It was through the mediation of the Saṅgha that a settlement was brought about between Sena II (853-887) and yuvarāja Mahinda.[3] The Saṅgha intervened again to make peace between Kassapa IV (898-914) and ādipāda Mahinda. Ādipāda Mahinda who had been living in Rohaṇa at the time, rose in rebellion against the king and advanced with forces to seize the royal province. The king had to subdue him twice, first by sending the royal army and second, by the influence of ādipāda Mahinda's father. Later, however Mahinda was faced with a rebellion within his own province and was forced to seek the help of the king. The monks promptly intervened and it was through

---

1. Duṭṭhagāmaṇī blamed the thera for not asking them to make peace earlier, and further said that 'If you had but sent a sāmaṇera of seven years our strife would not have taken place' (Mv., chap. XXIV, vv. 49-57).

2. Mv., chap. XXXIII, vv. 73-77.

3. Cv., chap. 51, vv. 13-14.

their mediation that friendly relations between the two were established.[1]

The monks, as the literati of society, were in a position to impart knowledge in various fields to the laymen. The education of princes from ancient times was at least in part entrusted to monks, and the rulers of our period seem to have conformed to this pattern. This placed the Saṅgha in an advantageous position, for when princes ascended the throne they generally continued their devotion to their former teachers who henceforth remained as their informal advisers.[2] Goṭhābhaya (249-262), who admired the thera Saṁghamitta, entrusted to him his two sons - Jeṭṭhatissa (263-273) and Mahāsena (274-301) - for their education.[3] The necessary training in statecraft (nīti) was given to Dhātusena (455-473) by a learned bhikkhu.[4] Aggabodhi VIII (804-815) built the parivena called Bhūta and granted it together with the necessary revenues to his teacher (sakācariya) and his retinue of three hundred monks.[5] According to the Cūlavaṁsa, the

---

1. Cv., chap. 52, vv. 4-9.
2. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 116, chap. XXXVII, vv. 1-5.
3. Mv., chap. XXXVI, vv. 114-117.
4. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 14-21.
5. Cv., chap. 49, v. 46.

study of the Buddhist scriptures seems to have been included in the education of princes in medieval Ceylon.[1] There is reference to at least a few rulers of this period who were well-versed in the teachings of the Buddha. Moggallāna II (531-551) composed a poem in praise of the Dhamma and recited it at the close of the sermon.[2] Kassapa V (914-923) is credited with the compiling of Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, a Sinhalese commentary on the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā.[3] The Slab Inscription of Kassapa V records his mastery of the teachings of the Buddha, 'He preached that same dhamma (Abhidhamma) in the presence of his esteemed teacher and extolled the virtues of the Buddha in his own language'.[4] Sena IV (954-956) is also said to have possessed excellent knowledge of the works of the Tipiṭaka.[5] These references are of importance as they reveal the part played by the Saṅgha in the education of the kings in medieval Ceylon. The teaching of

---

1. Cv., chap. 64, vv. 3-4.

2. Cv., chap. 41, v. 60.

3. Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, ed. Madauyangoda Wimalakitti, p. 295.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 43. The same event is also recorded in the Cūlavaṁsa, chap. 52, v. 48.

5. Cv., chap. 54, v. 4.

sacred texts for laymen, was entirely in the hands of the Saṅgha and it is almost certain that the above rulers also had their religious training under the supervision of the Saṅgha.

The Saṅgha, it appears, acted as the advisers of the king not only in spiritual affairs but also on political problems. Aggabodhi I (571-604) is said to have kept piously to the instructions of a thera named Dāṭhāsiva.[1] In clarifying this, Geiger says that Dāṭhāsiva apparently took a post at court corresponding to that of purohita in the Indian courts.[2] On the instruction of his adviser, a mahāthera also named Dāṭhāsiva, Aggabodhi IV (667-683) made ample amends for all the injustices done to the monasteries by his predecessors.[3] Mahinda II (777-797) took counsel with the Saṅgha[4] before

---

1. Cv., chap. 42, v. 22.

2. Cv., p. 67, n. 8.

3. Cv., chap. 46, vv. 6-16.

4. The rulers seem to have followed this practice even in the time of the Buddha. Ajātasattu, king of Magadha, having formed a grim resolution for the overthrow of the Vajjis, sent his messengers to the Buddha for advice (D.N., II, pp. 72-76; see also A.N., IV, pp. 17-20). It is said in one of the Jātakas that the king of Kosala consulted the thera Dhanuggahatissa (a contemporary of the Buddha) and followed his instructions in conquering his opponent, Ajātasattu (Vaddhaki-sūkara Jātaka (no. 283), Jātaka, II, ed. Fausböll).

launching the final and third attack on the rebel Dappula. 'The king wishing to bring order into the land, assembled in the Thūpārāma all the bhikkhus and other wise persons . . . informed them of the events and with their consent set out to war against Dappula'.[1] Māna[2] is said to have protected the people according to the advice of a bhikkhu.[3] The Cūḷavaṁsa also records that when the ruler of Laṅkā[4] heard of his excellence - the excellence of the grandson of Dāṭhopatissa who had undergone the ceremony of world renunciation in the order of the Buddha[5] - sought him out to win him as his counsellor. It further adds that the king who prized highly the excellence of this bhikkhu as long as he dwelt there, 'ruled the people in justice, walking in the way marked out by his advice'.[6] 'Since that time', says the Cūḷavaṁsa, 'the sovereigns of Laṅkā

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, vv. 126-129.

2. The author of the Cūḷavaṁsa seems to have taken the details regarding this ruler from a new source, probably from the 'Chronicle of Rohaṇa'.

3. The king's elder brother who underwent the ceremony of world-renunciation is meant here (Cv., chap. 57, vv. 19 and 23).

4. It is not clear which ruler is meant here.

5. Cv., chap. 57, v. 31.

6. tassānusatthimaggaṭṭho lokaṁ dhammena pālayi (Cv., chap. 57, v. 35).

make a bhikkhu spend the night in a small temple of the gods and place him, if he has found favour with the deity, in the leading position (mūlaṭṭhāna) and when they protect Order and people (lokasāsana), they act according to the counsel of the bhikkhus who hold the leading position'.[1] It is quite likely that the mūlaṭṭhāna referred to in the above passage does not refer to a premier,[2] but to the position of a chief monk. The passage also establishes beyond doubt that a bhikkhu held the position of a royal adviser from the time referred to above, though it is not clear what reign is meant.[3] It has been suggested that this post was created in the time of Aggabodhi I (571-604) because there is a reference to such a position in his reign.[4] But, long before this time, Upatissa I (365-401) is said to have sought the advice of the Saṅgha when there was a famine and a plague in the country, and acted

---

1. mūlattaṁ āvasantānaṁ yatīnaṁ anusāsanā Laṅkissarā pavattanti pālentā lokasāsanaṁ (Cv., chap. 57, vv. 38-39).

2. Cv., p. 196, n. 4.

3. See M. B. Ariyapala, Society in Medieval Ceylon, p. 103.

4. Ibid. The origin of this position seems to hark back to a very early period. Saddhātissa (137-119 B.C.) requested the Saṅgha to name a bhikkhu who would act in the capacity of an adviser to him (mamovādaṁ bhikkhuṁ niddisathāti, Sīhalavatthuppakaraṇa, p. 138).

according to their instructions.[1] The king inquired from the Saṅgha if anything was done by the Buddha in such a situation to alleviate the suffering of the people, and the bhikkhus described to him how the Ratana-sutta was recited by the Buddha when Vesali was afflicted by such a calamity.[2] Then the king caused a similar ceremony to be performed and, according to the Cūlavaṁsa, this relieved the people and the country from the famine and the plague. Upatissa declared that this ceremony should be performed whenever there was a similar calamity in the Island.[3] Thus it appears that the Saṅgha came to the assistance of the rulers when they were in distress. Aggabodhi IV (667-683),[4] Sena II (853-887)[5] and Kassapa V (914-923)[6] are also said to have performed similar ceremonies when they were faced with such problems and it is not unlikely

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 189-198.

2. Paramatthajotikā (Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā, Sinhalese edition), pp. 204-205. When Vesali was vexed by the ills of a drought and pestilence, the Buddha visited the city on the invitation of Licchavis, and recited the Ratana-sutta. Since that time the ceremony of chanting Paritta has become established among the Buddhists and is extensively observed, even at the present day.

3. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 189-198.

4. Cv., chap. 46, v. 5.

5. Cv., chap. 51, vv. 80-81.

6. Cv., chap. 52, v. 80.

that they, too, followed the advice of the Saṅgha.

There were occasions when the advice of the Saṅgha was sought in selecting a successor to the throne. Even as early as the first century B.C., the ministers took counsel with the Saṅgha before appointing Thūlatthana in preference to Lajjitissa, the lawful heir to the throne.[1] The Badulla Pillar Inscription of Udaya IV (946-954) also sheds some light on this political role of the Saṅgha. A phrase in this record says, äpā mahayā siri vidä piḷivela se rädä päminä rädä kaḷa[2] 'who has been established in dominion having attained to the sovereignty in regular succession after having enjoyed the dignity of äpā and mahayā'.[3] In this translation, Paranavitana has taken the word rädä to mean 'in the kingship'. He says that the locative ending in the word rädä (in the kingship) indicates that kaḷa is passive in meaning, and precludes the phrase being interpreted as 'who reigned'.[4] If this interpretation is correct, there appears to have been a

---

1. Mv., chap. XXXIII, vv. 17-18.
2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 182, lines A. 8-11.
3. Ibid., p. 189.
4. Ibid., p. 189, n. 2.

'body' or 'group' responsible for the installation of a king on the throne. A comparison with the practices of later times may suggest that some members of the Saṅgha were included in this group. When Rājādhirājasiṁha of Kandy died, the prince who succeeded him to the throne - the last king of Kandy - was elected by an assembly of the chief ministers of the state, the governors of the provinces and the heads of the Buddhist church.[1] Evidence for similar occasions are not wanting in the earlier period. After the death of Vijayabāhu I (1065-1120), the deceased king's sister, her three sons, the officers of state and the monks who dwelt in the eight chief vihāras 'took counsel together, and with one mind anointed the sub-king'.[2] In this respect it is also worthwhile to draw attention to the procedure followed by Vijayabāhu I (1065-1120) in appointing Jayabāhu to the position of uparāja. The Cūḷavaṁsa records 'he granted the dignity of uparāja, at the counsel of the bhikkhus to Jayabāhu'.[3] Probably, a similar procedure was adopted in the tenth century, in

---

1. For an account of the methods adopted in selecting a candidate to the throne in the Kandyan period see John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants, p. 159 ff.

2. Cv., chap. 61, vv. 1-3.

3. Cv., chap. 60, v. 87.

inaugurating the rule of a new king; and the practice followed in Kandyan times, as many another of the institutions in vogue during the Kandyan period, was one dating back to the medieval age.

However, it cannot be said with certainty, if the consultation of the Saṅgha in the selection of successors to the throne was a customary procedure. As has been pointed out by Gunawardana, it is possible that, at least in some of these cases, the monks were invited in consideration of the political value of their support in cases of disputable succession.[1] But, on the other hand, it is important to draw attention to the proclamation made by Mahinda IV (956-972) in his Jetavanārama Slab Inscription.[2] According to this it was believed that kingship was bestowed on the rulers of Laṅkā by the great community of monks (Mahāsaṅgha). And it is quite possible that in making this proclamation Mahinda IV had referred to a belief current at the time. Therefore, it is not unlikely that there were also occasions when the sanction of the Saṅgha was obtained in the installation of a king on the throne.

Apart from playing the role of informal political

---

1. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., p. 299.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 234.

advisers, the monks themselves seem to have taken an active interest in the affairs of the state. When the Tamils invaded the Island in the fifth century, the monks took an active part in liberating the country from them. It was the Saṅgha[1] that brought up Dhātusena at great risk, and set him about the task of driving away the Tamil invaders.[2] In the struggle between Kassapa I (473-491) and Moggallāna I (491-508) the monks extended their support to the latter, who was their choice. The chronicle relates that Kassapa I, after gaining power, did his best to lead a virtuous life and gain the goodwill of the Saṅgha. But the attitude of the Saṅgha towards Kassapa was rather indifferent. They went to the length of refusing to accept the gift of the enlarged and improved Issarasamaṇa monastery, so that Kassapa had to force it on them by dedicating it to the Buddha image.[3] But on the other hand, they allowed Moggallāna to collect his troops at a vihāra,[4] and, after his victory over Kassapa I, he was received ceremoniously at the Mahāvihāra by the Saṅgha.[5]

---

1. His uncle who was a bhikkhu was particularly responsible for this task.

2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 14-35.

3. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 10-13.

4. Cv., chap. 39, v. 21.

5. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 29-31.

There were also occasions when the Saṅgha intervened to select their favourites for the throneat the risk of violating the laws of succession.[1] Their position as mentors to the throne certainly gave the monks power to influence the king. But this relationship was different in character from that which existed between the Indian kings and their court-Brāhmins.[2] The Brāhmin connexion was formal and related to court ritual, while in Ceylon it appeared to be more personal, intimate and friendly.[3]

The king, on his part, played a significant role in the affairs of the Saṅgha. From the beginning, the king acted as the great benefactor of the Sāsana. Almost all the rulers of this period with the exception of a few usurpers, did their utmost to further the welfare of the Sāsana. They had images of the Buddha and his disciples made,[4] vihāras and cetiyas built.[5] They repaired what

---

1. The Saṅgha gave their approval to consecrate Thūlatthana in preference to Lajjitissa, the lawful heir to the throne (Mv., chap. XXXIII, vv. 17-18). It was again with their consent that Mānābharaṇa, a son of Vijayabāhu's sister, was appointed to the position of uparāja disregarding the rights of Vikkamabāhu who was Vijayabāhu's son and legitimate heir to the throne (Cv., chap. 61, v. 4).

2. U. N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, p. 59

3. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 129.

4. E.Z., vol. II, p. 67, lines 10-17; Cv., chap. 37, v. 68; chap. 38, v. 58, vv. 62-64; chap. 42, v. 18.

5. Cv., chap. 38, v. 45; chap. 42, v. 23 and 43; chap. 50, v. 70; chap. 51, v. 129; chap. 52, v. 13; chap. 53, v. 11

had been dilapidated[1] and caused many religious festivals to be held.[2] Apart from being benefactors to the Sāsana, the kings also took an active interest in the welfare of its representatives, the Saṅgha. Both the inscriptions and the chronicles abound with references to grants made to the Saṅgha in the period under survey. These grants can roughly be divided into three categories: first, the grant of lands, fields, villages and salterns;[3] second, tanks and canals;[4] third, the levying of taxes and the collection of fines.[5]

Of these the land-grants[6] seem to have become progressively extensive during the period under consideration

---

1. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 70-72; chap. 42, vv. 56-57; chap. 46, v. 8; chap. 50, v. 67; chap. 51, v. 69; E.Z., vol. I, p. 46, p. 222.

2. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 68-90; chap. 44, v. 46; chap. 51, v. 84

3. See pp. 258-260 below.

4. A considerable number of tanks and canals have been granted to the monasteries by the rulers of this period. Dhātusena (455-473) who granted eighteen tanks to the monks of the Theriya nikāya deserves special mention in this connexion. See also Cv., chap. 50, v. 72; E.Z., vol. I, p. 31; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 115.

5. An inscription of the tenth century says that a tax was levied for the maintenance of the Mahāpāli, the great refectory of the Saṅgha, at the rate of one pata (Skt. prastha) from each sack of paddy brought into the city of Anurādhapura (E.Z., vol. III, p. 133). There is no information however, whether similar taxes were levied in other towns as well. Whatever was collected as fines for offences committed within the villages and lands of a monastery was also given to the monastery (E.Z., vol. I, p. 44; E.Z., vol. II, p. 9).

6. The practice of endowing monasteries with land, villages

Mahānāga (569-571) granted three hundred fields to the Jetavana monastery and a thousand fields to the Mahāvihāra.[1] Similarly, the yuvarāja of Aggabodhi I (571-604) donated two hundred fields to the Girivihāra which he built, presumably in Dakkhiṇadesa.[2] There is no means of verifying the reliability of the figures given in the chronicle. Even after making allowances for possible exaggerations, it would appear that the grants of this period had increased in extent and value. Aggabodhi I is also said to have endowed a number of monasteries with maintenance villages.[3] Aggabodhi II (604-614) granted to the Abhayagiri monastery the village of Aṅgaṇasālaka.[4] Jeṭṭhatissa III (628) is credited with the granting of maintenance villages to a number of monasteries.[5] Aggabodhi V (718-724) granted the village of Devatissa in the district of Koṭṭhavāta

---

and irrigation works was known as early as the second century B.C. The Dūvegala inscription of Lañjitissa (119-109 B.C.) records the grant of a tank and of land (Ceylon Antiquary, vol. III, p. 12).

1. Cv., chap. 41, v. 98.

2. Cv., chap. 42, v. 9.

3. Cv., chap. 42, vv. 15-18 and v. 21.

4. Cv., chap. 42, v. 64.

5. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 96-101.

to the monastery called Rājanīdīpika.[1] The Nāgirikanda Rock Inscription of Kumāra Dhātusena (508-516) records a grant of tanks and rice fields to the monastery Bamaṇa-giriya.[2] Udaya I (797-801) assigned maintenance villages to the Pucchārāma monastery and the bhikkhus dwelling in the Giribhaṇda monastery.[3] The assignment of maintenance villages to various monasteries are also recorded in the reign of Aggabodhi VIII (804-815).[4] Similar gifts of villages either to the monasteries or to the inmates of a certain fraternity are recorded in the reigns of Aggabodhi IX (831-833), Sena I (833-853), Sena II (853-887), Kassapa IV (898-914), Kassapa V (914-923), Dappula IV (924-935), Sena III (938-946) and Mahinda IV (956-972).[5]

As a result of these excessive donations bestowed on the community of monks, the monastery of this period came to represent not merely a collection of resident monks

---

1. Cv., chap. 48, v. 1.
2. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 123.
3. Cv., chap. 49, vv. 15-17, 28-34.
4. Cv., chap. 49, v. 47.
5. Cv., chap. 49, vv. 89-90; Cv., chap. 50, v. 73; Cv., chap. 51, v. 71, v. 74; Cv., chap. 52, vv. 13-14, v. 26; Cv., chap. 52, v. 58; Cv., chap. 53, v. 10; Cv., chap. 53, v. 31; Cv., chap. 54, v. 40; E.Z., vol. II, p. 57.

but also a corporate property-owning institution.[1] Moreover, these grants brought about a significant change in the attitude of the Saṅgha towards wealth. A bhikkhu as the name implies is a mendicant,[2] who has taken the vow of poverty and cannot therefore own property or engage in any profit-making employment. According to Vinaya regulations, every gift of whatever nature made to a bhikkhu was to be treated as sāṅghika, i.e., as belonging to the entire community of monks. The earliest donations, mostly of caves, were made to the entire Saṅgha in keeping with this regulation as is implied by the phrase agata anagata catudisa sagasa 'to the community of monks of the four directions, present and absent'.[3] But with the growth of monasteries, the practice of granting lands, fields, villages, tanks and so forth became well established. Such grants were made not to the 'entire community' as before but to a particular group of monks, resident within a particular monastery, which was often mentioned by name. In consequence, the Saṅgha in the course of time became monastic landlords.

The economic power of the Saṅgha coupled with the belief that 'kingship was bestowed on the rulers of Laṅkā

---

1. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., p. 282.

2. Bhikkhu means an almsman, beggar (Pali-English Dictionary (P.T.S.)).

3. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I, pp. 2-4.

by the community of monks'[1] may have been a threat to the power of the king. But the Saṅgha in Ceylon never attempted to gain political power for themselves though on more than one occasion they tried to influence the succession by nominating their favourites to the throne. On the other hand, they lacked the necessary authority and unity to acquire any such political power. The absence of a single leader and the division of the Saṅgha into three nikāyas weakened the power of the Saṅgha to a considerable extent.[2] Moreover, they were prohibited by the Vinaya regulations from taking any interest in the political affairs of the country.[3] Even the Buddha acknowledged the superiority of the king as the leader of men[4] and advised the Saṅgha to follow the king;[5] and the Saṅgha appear in general to have abided by this advice. However, the authority of the Saṅgha proved to be a strong counterbalance to the unlimited power commonly associated with kingship.[6]

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 237.
2. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., p. 251.
3. D.N., I, p. 8.
4. rājā mukhaṁ manussānaṁ (Sutta Nipāta, p. 107).
5. Anujānāmi bhikkhave rājānaṁ anuvattituṁ (Mahāvagga, p. 164)
6. Ralph Pieris, Sinhalese Social Organization, p. 9.

A particularly important outcome of the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha was the grant of immunities to the lands belonging to the monasteries. The purpose and the origin of setting up pillars containing immunities are explained in a passage in the Samantapāsādikā:

> As for lābha-sīmā (income area), it was neither allowed by the Buddha nor established by the theras who collated the dhamma (in council). But kings and ministers after building a vihāra define (boundaries within a distance of) a gāvuta, half yojana or a yojana around the place, and set up pillars inscribed with the names saying 'this is the income-area of our vihāra', and fix boundaries saying 'whatever is produced within this, all that we give to our vihāra'.[1]

The rulers of the ninth and tenth centuries seem to have followed this practice when they established pillar inscriptions[2] granting immunities to monastic lands.

It is of importance to take into consideration the contents of an immunity grant in order to have an idea

---

1. Samantapāsādikā (Colombo, 1900), p. 260.

2. There are numerous examples of edicts, granting immunities to estates, belonging to religious institutions, and, sometimes, to private individuals in medieval Ceylon and they are all written in the same style (for example, see E.Z., vol. I, nos. 11-13; 16 and 17; E.Z., vol. II, nos. 1-12). In fact in the ninth and tenth centuries, a formula in which such documents were worded, seems to have been in use. There are many variations in detail but, in the main, all these grants of immunities were drawn up according to a stereotyped model.

of the nature of the immunities granted:

> The magiva and pegiva[1] shall not enter this village. The kulīs,[2] melāṭsi[3] and the officers of the royal household shall not enter. Ulavādu and perenāttiyam[4] shall not enter; chiefs of districts and provincial officers shall not enter. Officers of the two treasuries and

---

1. Wickremasinghe has rendered the terms magiva and pegiva (var. maṅg-giva, piyagiva, maṅgdiv, pediv) into English as tramps and vagrants (E.Z., vol. II, p. 48). Paranavitana is of opinion that they denote royal officials (E.Z., vol. III, p. 146). In a pillar inscription from Mihintale (A.I.C., no. 115) the phrase maṅgdiv pediv no vadnā isā is followed by sesu radkol kämiyan no vadnā isā 'not to be entered by other royal officers'. This may imply as Paranavitana has pointed out that maṅgdiv and pediv, too, were royal officers.

2. The meaning of this word is not certain.

3. The most frequent form of this word is melāṭsi; other variants are melāṭṭi, melātti, melāṭsi and melāksi. This word has been used to denote a tax as well as the officers connected with the collection of this tax. In some records melāṭsi is followed by the verb noganna and in others by novadnā; in the first place it means 'the melāṭsi should not be levied', and in the second 'the melāṭsi should not enter'.

4. These two terms - ulavādu perenāttiyam - are also generally found bracketed together. It is evident from the inscriptions that they denoted a class of royal officers. Paranavitana has taken the word ulavādu to mean a class of functionaries who had the right of entry to the inner music hall of the royal palace, and perenāttu a lower grade who were not permitted to proceed further than the dancing hall in the outer precincts of the palace (E.Z., vol. III, pp. 144-145; vol. V, pt. I, p. 140, n. 2). Gunawardana has given more plausible reasons in explaining this word as an officer in charge of a province. For details see R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 265-267.

the two departments[1] shall not enter. Aräkkan[2] and peraläkkan[3] shall not enter. Archers and guards shall not enter. Irrigation officers, däli-gattan (probably bird-catchers) and bearers of iron clubs shall not enter. Milch-cows, village oxen, carts and buffaloes shall not be taken. Labourers who serve by turns[4] and rice given in rotation (by the villagers) shall not be appropriated.[5]

Apart from the immunities mentioned above, another important phrase that occurs in some of these grants is

---

1. deruvanä dekamtän:- These two classes of officials are invariably mentioned together whenever both occur in the same record. Kamtaï could connote a 'department' or officials in a secondary sense. Hence dekamtän may mean two officers or two places of business. What these two were, we cannot say with certainty. Deruvanä may mean officers in charge of the two treasuries. The practice of having two treasuries dates from ancient times, for Kauṭilya enjoins the king to possess, in addition to the treasure house within the fort another one at the extreme boundary of the kingdom (Arthaśāstra, trans. Shamasastry, p. 61).

2. Aräkkan is the plural of aräki which could be derived from Skt. ārakṣika or P. ārakkhika (Jātaka, vol. IV, p. 29) 'watcher' or 'guard'. However, it is not certain whether this term indicates the village guard mentioned in Sanskrit law books or the subordinates of the dignitary designated araksamaṇa who, it appears, was entrusted with the care of the royal treasury.

3. This occurs in many other records both alone and in company with the aräkkan. If the word is taken as a derivati of P. lekhaka, this word may signify a class of scribes. It is likely as Paranavitana has pointed out that they had to supervise the collection, and record the dues apper taining to the royal treasury (E.Z., vol. III, p. 145).

4. Väriyan värisāl:- For an explanation of these terms see R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 262-263, pp. 268-269.

5. Aṭavīragollāva Pillar Inscription, E.Z., vol. II, p. 48.

meyat koṭā van vädä no gannā isā 'those who have come here after committing murder shall not be arrested'.[1] It should also be noted here that the quotations given above represent only the more frequent and important clauses that are met with in an immunity grant. On the whole the immunity grants of the period under survey reveal a great deal of variation in the extent and types of the immunities granted. No satisfactory explanation, however, can be given concerning these variations.

From a detailed study of the immunities granted, it becomes clear that the king has taken a particular interest in exempting the lands concerned from the encumbrance of the payment of regular taxes to the state. The exemption of monastic lands from many royal dues and taxes such as melāṭsi, maňgiv, kulī, demel kulī, hel kulī and sutvat is mentioned in many of these grants.[2] Moreover, most of the officers who were forbidden to enter these lands seem to have been in charge of collecting taxes and dues of the state.[3]

---

1. E. Z., vol. II, p. 37, p. 42.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 169, p. 97, p. 205; E.Z., vol. II, p. 5; E.Z., vol. III, p. 109; A.I.C., no. 115.

3. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., p. 267.

Another immunity granted to the monastery of this period, as seen above, was the exemption of väriyan (those who served in turn) in monastic lands from being sequestrated for service to the state.[1] This does not necessarily imply that the tenants in monastic lands were free from corvée duty. Most probably they were expected to perform this duty in respect of the monastery concerned. This may have resulted in transferring the right to corvée labour that the king enjoyed to the monastery. However, all the monasteries do not seem to have enjoyed this privilege. This is made clear by the absence of this provision in some of the immunity grants of this period.[2]

Many records prohibit the entry of royal officers into monastic lands. Among them are mentioned fiscal officers, treasury officials, inspectors in charge of corvée, district and provincial officers and irrigation officers.[3] The mention of the latter officials is of importance. This may indicate that the irrigation rights of monasteries

---

1. Apart from the inscription mentioned above many other inscriptions carry this injunction. See E.Z., vol. II, pp. 5-8; E.Z., vol. III, pp. 100-113, pp. 219-225.

2. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 29-38, pp. 182-190.

3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 97, p. 170. p. 207; E.Z., vol. II, pp. 14-19, p. 25, p. 38, p. 48, p. 53; E.Z., vol. IV, p. 64, p. 185.

were also acknowledged.[1] It cannot be said with certainty if the above-mentioned officers were completely debarred from entering the monastic lands. On some occasions it has been said that they were not to enter monastic property to fell trees or take away workmen, carts, oxen and buffaloes.[2] However, from this it becomes clear that the controlling authority of the state officials over lands and villages belonging to the monasteries was limited to a considerable extent. On the other hand, this indicates the transfer of considerable administrative powers to the monastery over its lands and tenants. The king, thus appears, to have acknowledged the rights of the monastery as an independent institution.

Another important aspect that some of these grants covered was the right of sanctuary. This ensured complete immunity for offenders seeking refuge in monastic lands. The Iripinniyāva Inscription of Kassapa IV (898-914) refers to this immunity when it says that 'thieves and those who entered after committing assault were not to be arrested'.[3]

---

1. In his Polonnaruva Rajamāligāva Inscription, Mahinda IV has ordered the velvässan and velkämiyan (officers in charge of irrigation) not to interfere with the irrigation rights of a monastery (E.Z., vol. II, p. 53).

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 47; E.Z., vol. III, p. 223.

3. sorun koṭāvan no gannā koṭ (E.Z., vol. I, p. 169). See also E.Z., vol. I, p. 174.

Many other records refer to this privilege enjoyed by the monastic lands.[1] In some inscriptions it has been said that officers were not to enter monastic lands even to arrest criminals responsible for murder.[2] This does not necessarily imply that the criminals who entered monastic lands were exempted from punishment. But no clarifying evidence is available in these records or in other literary works regarding the procedure followed in such cases. The officers seem to have had the authority to arrest such offenders who had sought refuge in the monastic lands after they had been made to quit those lands.[3] But no power was vested in the officers to arrest them within the boundaries of these lands.[4] The granting of such privileges to the monastery may have caused a few problems to the state regarding the maintenance of order and the administration of justice. This is evident from the measures taken by some rulers to overcome these difficulties. In his Moragoḍa Inscription, Kassapa IV declares that 'if there be any

---

1. E.Z., vol II, pp. 19-25, pp. 34-38, p. 42; E.Z., vol. I, p. 174.

2. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 285; E.Z., vol. I, p. 169.

3. E.Z., vol. IV, p. 251; E.Z., vol. II, p. 25.

4. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 203, 205; E.Z., vol. II, pp. 6-8, pp. 23, 29.

offenders guilty of assault they should be evicted from the village'.[1] The Kaḷudiyapokuṇa Inscription of Sena IV (954-956) lays down the order that no outsider who had committed assault or murder should be admitted to the village.[2] However, violation of this privilege could lead to serious conflicts as is evidenced by the events that took place in the reign of Udaya III (935-938).[3]

The above discussion on immunity grants may reveal that as a result of the close connexion with the Saṅgha, the rulers of this period went to the extent of abandoning certain economic and political rights in favour of the Saṅgha. They transferred to the monastery, on their own free-will, the rights - the fiscal and irrigation rights, the administrative and judicial authority - they had over monastic property.[4]

As the benefactor and defender of the Sāsana, it was one of the primary duties of the king to look after

---

1. . .me gämhi keṭū (ke)nekun äta gämin piṭat karanu isā . . . (E.Z., vol. I, p. 205).

2. . . bähärä minī koṭā no vädda denu isā . . . (E.Z., vol. III, p. 265).

3. See pp. 280-281 below.

4. For a detailed discussion on immunity grants, see R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 261-282.

the well-being of the Saṅgha. It is explicitly stated in the Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972) that the dignity of kingship was bestowed on the kings by the great community of monks for the purpose of defending their bowls and robes.[1] Hence, we find quite often kings engaged in 'the purification of the Sāsana' whenever they found it to be disorganized or corrupt. By a regulative act,[2] Moggallāna I (491-508) purified the Sāsana which was disorganized during the troublesome days of his brother, Kassapa.[3] Kumāradhātusena (508-516) is also said to have purified the Sāsana after a recital of the sacred texts.[4] Similarly, Moggallāna III (614-619) reformed the order by a regulative act.[5] Such 'purifications by regulative acts' were also carried out in the reigns of Silāmeghavaṇṇa (619-628), Aggabodhi VII (772-777), Sena II (853-887),

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 237. Wickremasinghe translates tumā pay sivur as 'the bowl and robe of the Buddha'. But this is inaccurate. Pay-sivur (P. patta-cīvara) 'the bowl and the robe'. This has been used symbolically to denote the Saṅgha.

2. Dhammakammena. This means literally a legal act. The expression often occurs in the Cūḷavaṁsa to denote the manner in which the reforms of the Sāsana were carried out. These acts are always concerned with the removal of abuses which have crept into the Order and with the punishment of guilty bhikkhus.

3. Cv., chap. 39, v. 57.

4. Cv., chap. 41, v. 2.

5. Cv., chap. 44, v. 46.

Kassapa IV (898-914) and Kassapa V (914-923).[1] Not only the 'purifications' but the ceremonies of Admission and Ordination were also carried out under the patronage of the king. Kassapa IV and Kassapa V are said to have made arrangements for the admission of the new bhikkhus after the purifications they held.[2] Kassapa V (914-923) seems to have taken upon himself the role of the spiritual mentor of the monks. In his Anurādhapura Slab Inscription, he advises them on the question of the recruitment of new monks and lays down the order that 'if any are to be admitted to the Order they shall be those familiar with the four sections (bhāṇavāra) of the Paritta'.[3] He further stated that nothing whatever was to be received from those entering the Order.

Thus it is clear from the foregoing that the task of maintaining the discipline of the Saṅgha also devolved

---

1. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 75-79; chap. 48, v. 71; chap. 51, v. 64; chap. 52, v. 10; chap. 52, v. 44.

2. Nīharitvāna dussīle nikāyattayavāsisu
gāhāpesi nave bhikkhū āvāse tattha tattha so (Cv., chap. 52, v. 10). . . . gahetvā navake bhikkhū akās'āvāsa-pūraṇaṁ (Cv., chap. 52, v. 44).

3. . . . mahaṇu karat pirit satar baṇvar piṇisvūvan mahaṇ karanu isā mahaṇvannavun atin yam kavari vatak no gannā isā. . . (E.Z., vol. I, p. 48).

on the king. Since the division of the Saṅgha into three nikāyas, the participation of the king would have been essential for the carrying out of any reforms affecting the whole Order. The Saṅgha lacked the machinery to enforce the observance of ecclesiastical laws among its members, so that they had to depend on the coercive powers of the temporal leader for this purpose.[1] However, it should be noted here that though the king acted as the defender of the Sāsana, his authority over matters ecclesiastical was subservient to that of the Saṅgha. He had no power to force the Saṅgha to act against their wish. When, for example, Silāmeghavaṇṇa (617-626) requested the monks of the Mahāvihāra to perform the uposatha ceremony with those of the Abhayagiri, the Mahāvihāra refused to comply with the king's request, and the king was powerless to enforce his will.[2]

In the early days when there were no temporalities, the administration of a monastery was a simple affair,

---

1. The theory of the two domains (temporal and spiritual) is well expressed by a putative statement of Ajātasattu at the commencement of the first Buddhist Council held in Rājagaha when he said to the assembled monks, 'Yours is the authority of the faith as mine is of political power' (dhammacakka and āṇācakka) (Mahāvagga, V, p. 1; see N. A. Jayawickrema, The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna, p. 8). The above statement of Ajātasattu further implies that dhamma cannot operate in this world by itself as it needs the acquiescence, if not support of āṇā or the state.

2. Cv., chap. 44, v. 80.

but with the increase of monks and the establishment of large religious endowments yielding extensive incomes, this became rather complex.[1] Therefore the participation of the king in the regulation of the affairs of the monastery became necessary. The king had not only to safeguard the interests of the Saṅgha but also to protect the tenants of monastic lands from the high-handedness of monastic officials.

The rulers of this period, therefore, seem to have taken great care in enforcing regulations for the guidance of monks and laymen living within the precincts of the monasteries or in lands belonging to them.[2] The Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V (914-923) contains regulations enacted by him in connexion with monastic duties and administration of temple property. It is remarkable to note here the great care with which the monastic rules were drawn up with a view to securing the independence, the exalted prestige, and, above all, the purity of the Sāsana. No kind of corruption was tolerated in the management of temple property, no slackness in the observance of religious ceremonies. No monk of questionable

---

1. For a discussion on the administration of monasteries, see R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., pp. 131-194.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 42, pp. 75-113, p. 230.

character was allowed to remain in the monastery, and for anyone who desired to enter the Order a minimum knowledge of the Dhamma was insisted upon.[1] Sena IV (954-956) also laid down rules pertaining to the monks and monastic officials.[2] A similar set of rules is found again in the tablets of Mahinda IV (956-972) at Mihintale. This is the most extensive record available on the administrative organization of monasteries. It contains rules and regulations 'in respect of the monks living in the vihāra, as well as in respect of the employees, the serfs, their respective duties and the receipts and disbursements'.[3] In laying down these rules the king seems to have taken into consideration every little detail of work necessary for the maintenance of the monastery. The king even set forth rules regarding the daily routine of monks:

> The monks residing in this vihāra shall rise at time of early dawn and shall meditate on the four protective formulas, and having finished cleansing the teeth, shall put on and cover themselves with their yellow robes as prescribed in the Sikakaraṇi (P. Sikkhā-karaṇi). They shall then go to the check-room of Āt-vehera and exercising a spirit of benevolence and reciting paritta formulas shall descend into the refectory and receive gruel and boiled rice.[4]

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 41-51.

2. E.Z., vol. III, p. 267.

3. . . . me veherä vasana maha-bik-saṅg himiyanaṭ isā kämiyanaṭ isā dasnaṭ isā kaṭä-yutu isā labanu-diyä-yutuse isā vivaruṇen ek-se koṭ me sirit tabana ladi (E.Z., vol. I, p. 91, lines 7-9).

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 99.

The king's participation in laying down rules regarding the discipline and routine-work of the Saṅgha is significant as this indicates the commanding position held by the king over the community of monks. The king, as the 'defender of the Sāsana', was in a position to enforce rules on the Saṅgha. However, it is noteworthy that although the king took the initiative in enforcing all the rules and regulations necessary for the discipline of the Saṅgha and the management of monasteries, he did so after consulting the monks of the monasteries concerned.[1] For instance, Mahinda IV convened an assembly of monks from both the Abhayagiri and the Cetiyagiri monasteries and conferred with them before laying down the regulations referred to above.[2]

As the defender of the Sāsana it was also the duty of the king to intervene when any dispute had arisen among the members of the Saṅgha. The inscriptions of this period refer to measures taken by the rulers to settle disputes among the Saṅgha. 'If an act of misconduct, such as a tumultuous dispute arises among the Saṅgha. . . the members

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, p. 99.

2. Ibid. Another inscription of Mahinda IV deals with the regulations which he instituted at the Abhayagiri vihāra. These rules are similar in character to those in his Mihintale Tablets and in the Jetavanārāma Sanskrit Inscription. However, they afford ample proof of the care which this king bestowed on the proper administration of monasteries (E.Z., vol. I, p. 230).

of the mula (fraternity) shall sit in council and settle it; if the monks cannot settle it, they shall hold a conference with the royal officers, and, due investigation being made, shall decide the case and impose punishment'.[1] Royal officials were to be sent to mediate if, as a result of a dispute, monks refused to partake of their gruel. They were to be discreetly persuaded to take the gruel; but no force was to be used.[2] All cases of misappropriation of monastic wealth were to be referred to committees of investigation comprising both monks and royal officials.[3] The king also intervened to settle disputes between the Saṅgha and officers of the state. The Vessagiri Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972) contains details of a dispute between the royal officers and inmates of the Isuramenu monastery concerning the rights to water from the Tisä (Tissa) tank.[4] When this

---

1. apilisaraṇa vat-himiyan isā lābhaladuvan isā avas laduvan isā kaḷaha yana varadak ata puvat mulä saṅgun hiṅdä nimavanu isā saṅgunvisin no nimat samdaruvan hā mulvä vicārakoṭ nimavā pat-pat seyin daṅḍuvan karanu isā (E.Z., vol. I, p. 48).

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 48.

3. Ibid., p. 49.

4. Ibid., p. 33.

was brought to the notice of the king, he gave his decision in favour of the monastery and confirmed its rights by setting up a pillar.[1]

As the temporal leader and protector of the Sāsana, the king seems to have had the right to inflict punishment on those who violate the monastic rules or commit any other grave offences. Kassapa V (914-923) laid down the order in the Slab Inscription at Anurādhapura, that monks responsible for violation of monastic regulations and abetters in such offences were not to be allowed to live in their monasteries.[2] The Vessagiri Slab Inscription records a similar proclamation made by Dappula V (924-935) in his second regnal year: '. . . those monks who shall prevent the performance of any of the duties at the time when they ought to be performed, shall leave the monastery, not being entitled to live there nor/to receive its emoluments'.[3] It is evident from the references given above that the king possessed the power to expel the monks from the monastery. There is a historical instance of expulsion

---

1. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 29-38.

2. E.Z., vol. I, p. 48.

3. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, lines 23-25.

of monks in the three fraternities, whose discipline was bad, in the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914).[1] However, there is no conclusive evidence to decide whether the expulsion from the monastery amounted to expulsion from the Order.[2]

There was at least one instance during the period under survey when a ruler imposed severe punishment on a group of bhikkhus who were guilty of murdering a fellow-monk.[3] During the reign of Silāmeghavaṇṇa (619-628), a monk called Bodhi, residing at the Abhayagiri, made a complaint to the king against the undisciplined behaviour of monks in that vihāra, and requested the king to hold a dhammakamma (regulative act). When the king authorized Bodhi to carry out the purification himself, a group of bhikkhus who disliked the action by Bodhi got together and killed him. The king hearing this had the hands of those bhikkhus cut off, put them in fetters and made them

---

1. Cv., chap. 52, v. 10.

2. Laksman S. Perera, 'Institutions of Ancient Ceylon from Inscriptions' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Ceylon, 1949), p. 1440; R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, op. cit., p. 260.

3. As early as in the first century A.D., Kaṇirarājānutissa had sixty monks who were convicted of high treason thrown into the 'dungeon of Kaṇira' (Mv., chap. XXXV, vv. 10-11).

watchers of bathing tanks; another hundred bhikkhus were banished.[1]

Although kings possessed the power to punish bhikkhus, they would normally refrain from doing so unless it was inevitable as this could cause displeasure among the Saṅgha and the people.[2] For example, when Silāmegha-vaṇṇa requested the monks of the Mahāvihāra to perform the uposatha ceremony with those of the Abhayagiri, the inmates of the Mahāvihāra refused to comply with the king's orders, but the king remained silent.[3] A ruler of the eleventh century went to the extent of punishing his/own queen for violating the immunity rights of the Saṅgha.[4] We hear of another ruler who gave his decision in favour of the Saṅgha in settling a dispute between the monks and the royal officials.[5]

---

1. Cv., chap. 44, vv. 75-80.

2. Mv., chap. XXXVII, vv. 17-25.

3. Cv., chap. 44, v. 80.

4. His own queen who had violated the immunity rights of the monasteries, was divested of her privileges and led by the neck and evicted from the city. Thus he conciliated the Mahāsaṅgha and demonstrated to the world his reverence for the Saṅgha (Cv., chap. 60, v. 54).

5. E.Z., vol. I, pp. 29-38.

It is evident from this discussion that there was a very close relationship between the king and the Saṅgha. The Saṅgha is called kuladevatā 'the family guardian spirits' of the royal house of Rohaṇa.[1] Upatissa I (365-406) is said to have partaken the meals from the Mahāpāli, the great refectory of the Saṅgha, all in his life - most probably to show his allegiance towards the Saṅgha.[2] However, it would be a distortion of facts to maintain that there was no friction between the king and the Saṅgha over matters political and mundane.[3] The Cūḷavaṁsa records details of a conflict occurring in the reign of Udaya III (935-938) when the rights of the monastery to give asylum (abhaya) to men wanted by the law had been challenged. Certain officials of the court who appear to have committed an offence, fled to Tapovana 'the Ascetic Grove' for fear of punishment. The king followed them to the Tapovana with his uparāja, and had the culprits beheaded. In indignation at this act of the king, probably because they considered it to be a breach

---

1. Mv., chap. XXII, v. 80.

2. Cv., chap. 37, v. 204.

3. Walpola Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p. 69.

of their privileges, the ascetic monks living there left the place and went to Rohaṇa in protest. This roused the army and the people of Anurādhapura to such an extent that they became rebellious, threatened the king, killed some of the officials who had helped in the act at the Tapovana and forced the yuvarāja and ādipāda to run after the monks. They went to the ascetic monks, threw themselves to the ground at their feet and having conciliated them by self-abasement made them return to Anurādhapura. The king, too, obtained their pardon in a humble manner.[1] Thus the conflict between the monks and the king was brought to an end by the humble submission of the latter and the rights of the former were acknowledged in a most dramatic manner. This incident not only reveals the interest taken by the Saṅgha to safeguard their privileges but also their ability to win public sympathy in such cases. Furthermore, it reveals the conflict between the two spheres of authority, political and spiritual (āṇā and dhamma) and the victory of the latter.

In the reign of Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667) there was further friction between the king and the inmates of

---

1. Cv., chap. 53, vv. 14-26.

the Mahāvihāra. When the king wanted to build a monastery for the Abhayagiri, the Mahāvihāra raised their objection on the ground that it was within their boundaries, but the king forcibly carried out his plan. The monks of the Mahāvihāra who became indignant at this act, applied the pattanikkujjanakamma[1] 'the turning down of the alms-bowl', the greatest insult that could be meted out to a layman, on the king.[2] The king was thus humiliated again before his people.

Many reasons can be adduced for this close affinity between the king and the Saṅgha. At the beginning, this relationship developed in an adventitious and circumstantial manner. In the initial stages it was largely a matter of personal equation between the Buddha and his royal contemporaries. Pasenadi claimed a special bond between him and the Enlightened One, because both were Kosalas while Bimbisāra's special interest in the Buddha was due to the fact that much of Buddha's ministry was

---

1. Bhikkhus go with their alms-bowls upright and turn them down in front of the house of the layman in question. This act symbolizes the idea that nothing from that layman will be accepted by the Saṅgha. This religious sanction which is regarded as a great insult is meted out to a layman who dishonours the Saṅgha or who tries to lessen its income (Cv., chap. 45, vv. 32-34).

2. Cv., chap. 45, vv. 29-34.

spent in his domain of Magadha.[1] Apart from these adventitious factors, however, there were other, and more compelling causes, for the early Buddhist Saṅgha to establish their own pattern of relationship with the king. They perceived at an early stage the advantages accruing from a felicitious relationship with the king and did everything in their power to accommodate the demands of the state. This is clearly shown in the modifications to many a Vinaya rule.[2] There was a further advantage to be gained by such a relationship for only through it could the Buddhists influence the deeds of the state and induce the rulers to live up to the ideal of the state they were laying down. The Buddha established a special relationship with the monarchs of his time and the creed established by him benefitted in many ways from royal patronage. Thus,

---

1. Bhagavā pi Kosalako ahampi Kosalako (Majjhima Nikāya, 1958, p. 371).

2. The Buddha duly recognized the authority of the state by amending many a Vinaya rule. The monks were forbidden to eat elephant flesh because the elephant was regarded as a royal animal and the king would be furious if he learnt that monks had eaten elephant flesh. They were to abstain from eating meat on those days when slaughter of animal was forbidden. They must postpone observing the vassa (rain-retreat) if the king so wished. They must not ordain serving soldiers or thieves wanted by the law and they were not to admit royal servants without appropriate permission (Mahāvagga, pp. 34-35, 78-79, 234-235).

it appears that at the beginning it was the Saṅgha who took the initiative in forming a relationship with the king.

In Ceylon, this relationship developed into a very close alliance between the king and the Saṅgha and the interest taken by the former in this connexion is more conspicuous. With the establishment of Buddhism in the Island, the rulers of Ceylon seem to have formed a close connexion with its representatives, the Saṅgha. According to tradition, Laṅkā was a favoured land by the Buddha. It is believed that the people of Laṅkā were appointed by the Buddha himself as custodians of his 'true-doctrine'.[1] The Buddha is said to have visited the Island three times,[2] so that he might honour and purify by his presence the land where his 'doctrine was to be preserved for five thousand years'. The chronicles of the Island give vivid descriptions of these visits of the Buddha made in the ninth month, the fifth year and the eighth year after the Enlightenment.[3] Although these visits are clearly legendary,

---

1. G. P. Malalasekera, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 13.

2. Mv., chap. I, vv. 19-83.

3. Dīpavaṁsa, chaps. I and II; Samantapāsādikā (P.T.S.), p. 1 ff; Mv., chap. I, vv. 19-83.

they prove the existence of such a tradition in the Island from the earliest days of its history.[1] According to the Mahāvaṁsa, even the last thoughts of the Buddha were concerned with the welfare of the Island. It is said that the Buddha on the day of his passing away requested the god Sakka to protect Laṅkā, 'the future home of the Sāsana', and Sakka handed over the guardianship of Laṅkā to god Uppalavaṇṇa.[2] It is not unlikely that these traditional beliefs, legends and customs of the Island had a considerable effect on the rulers in inducing them to establish a close alliance with the Saṅgha.

The planting of the Bodhi-tree[3] in the reign of Devānampiya Tissa[4] was symbolic of the establishment of

---

1. The oldest chronicle of the Island, the Dīpavaṁsa written in the fourth century A.D., mentions it. It is quite probable that the Dīpavaṁsa account - the earliest record which we have at present - was borrowed from an even earlier source. See G. P. Malalasekera, op. cit., p. 14; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 48-49.

2. Mv., chap. VII, vv. 2-5; Rājāvaliya, pp. 16-18.

3. Since the Buddha attained the Highest Enlightenment (sambodhi) when meditating under an assattha tree (Ficus religiosa) near Buddhagayā in Magadha, this tree, called Bodhi tree, is sacred to all Buddhists. According to the Cūlavaṁsa, it was customary to hold a festival in honour of the Bo-tree at the Mahāvihāra in the twelfth year of each reign (Cv., chap. 38, v. 57).

4. Mv., chap. XIX, vv. 54-64.

Buddhism and Buddhist culture in the Island. The relics of the Buddha were regarded as representing the Buddha himself and their enshrinement was as good as Buddha's presence in Laṅkā.[1] It is significant that the relics of the Buddha were considered as the property of the state. The Pātradhātu, the alms-bowl of the Buddha, which was brought to Ceylon during the reign of Devānampiya Tissa, was kept within the palace itself.[2] This was later considered such an important national possession that one of the seven Tamil invaders during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi took it with him to India and was 'well contented thereby'.[3] Upatissa I (365-406) used it in a ceremony to dispel a famine and a plague.[4] When the Tooth Relic was brought to Ceylon in the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328) it was housed in a shrine close to the palace.[5] In later times the possession of these two relics - the Tooth and the

---

1. In answering to the question of Devānampiya Tissa, 'Hast thou not told me that the Sambuddha is passed into Nibbāṇa?' the thera Mahinda said 'If we behold the relics we behold the Buddha' (Mv., chap. XVII, v. 3).

2. Mv., chap. XX, v. 13.

3. Mv., chap. XXXIII, v. 55. This was later brought back to Ceylon.

4. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 189-198.

5. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 92-95.

Alms-bowl - was considered essential for a prince who wished to be the legitimate ruler of the Island.[1] As Geiger pointed out, these relics had come to constitute, by the twelfth century, the national palladium, the symbols of legitimate kingship.[2] The Kesadhātu, the Hair Relic which was brought to Ceylon by Silākāla, was enshrined in an image house and paid special honour by Moggallāna I (491-508).[3]

Often the kings symbolized their submission to the Sāsana by dedicating the kingdom or the royal insignia. Duṭṭhagāmaṇi is said to have bestowed the kingdom on the Sāsana five times, for seven days consecutively on each occasion.[4] Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328) honoured the Tooth Relic by offering his kingdom.[5] Sometimes the white-umbrella (seta-chatta), the symbol of royalty, was dedicated to the Sāsana and the Saṅgha.[6] Aggabodhi II (604-614)

---

1. C. W. Codrington, Short History of Ceylon, pp. 57, 60, 67, 77, 80; U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, p. 289.

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 214.

3. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 49-54.

4. Mv., chap. XXXI, vv. 90-92, v. 111; chap. XXXII, v. 36; Pūjāvaliya, p. 17.

5. Dāṭhāvaṁsa, v. 360 ; Pūjāvaliya, p. 25.

6. Cv., chap. 39, v. 31; Mv., chap. XXXI, v. 90.

dedicated the Island of Laṅkā, i.e., the whole kingdom, together with his own person to the relics of the Thūpārāma.[1] Even though this act - the offering of the kingdom to the Sāsana - was performed nominally,[2] it may have created the impression that the kings of Laṅkā ruled the country not by their own accord but in the name of the Sāsana. Moreover, this may have lent support to the theory that 'Laṅkā belongs to the Sāsana'. This idea is developed further in later records. According to the inscriptions of Niśśaṅkamalla, non-Buddhist princes should not be established over the Island of Laṅkā which belongs to the religion of the Buddha.[3] An inscription of the tenth century states that the dignity of kingship was bestowed on the rulers of Laṅkā by the great community of monks (Mahāsaṅgha).[4] Undoubtedly, these ideas, beliefs and customs would have had a great impact on the rulers of the Island. Therefore, it is not surprising that the

---

1. Cv., chap. 42, v. 61.

2. In each time when it was offered to the Saṅgha, they duly returned it to the king (Cv., chap. 39, v. 31; Papañcasūdanī, II, p. 295).

3. E.Z., vol. II, p. 113, p. 161.

4. maha-saṅg-hu piliväyū raj-siri päminä (E.Z., vol. I, p. 237).

rulers of Ceylon have maintained, from the very outset, a close association with the representatives of the Sāsana.

The doctrine that the king of the Island should be a Buddhist,[1] can be cited as an another factor which induced the kings to take an interest in the affairs of the Saṅgha and the Sāsana. Moreover, the kings would have seen in the Saṅgha useful allies who could help in strengthening their hold over the people. The Saṅgha not only had easy access to the members of the royal family but were influential among all classes of people in the society. They were the teachers, advisers and guardians who enjoyed the respect and confidence of the laity.[2] The stories in the Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa,[3] the Sīhalavatthuppakaraṇa[4] and Pāli commentaries[5] produce ample evidence of this close connexion between the Saṅgha and the people. Therefore,

---

1. See pp. 227-234 above.

2. To obtain the approval of the Saṅgha was to ensure public support. That was probably why Duṭṭagāmaṇi put the relics of the Buddha into his spear and invited the Saṅgha to accompany him in the war (Mv., chap. XXV, vv. 1-4).

3. Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa, stories 19, 29, 33, 35.

4. Sīhalavatthuppakaraṇa, stories 1, 35, 36.

5. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, p. 570; Papañcasūdanī, p. 237; Manoratha pūraṇī, II, pp. 60-65, p. 276; cf. also E. W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p. 130; Walpola Rahula, op. cit., pp. 259-261.

the influential position of the Saṅgha in the lay society may also have encouraged kings to seek their friendship as a means of winning the goodwill of the people.

The participation of the king in religious ceremonies may also have given him an opportunity to improve his relations with the subjects. Many rulers of this period[1] seem to have taken an active interest in religious ceremonies. Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328) introduced the festival of Mahinda and ordered it to be held in each year.[2] Mahānāma (406-428) and Moggallāna III (614-619) instituted 'great thūpa-festivals throughout the territory of Laṅkā'.[3] Sena II (853-887) is said to have celebrated the Vesākha festival[4] with the poor people, giving them food and drink and cloths as they desired.[5] These festivals not only provided an opportunity to display royal pomp and pageantry

---

1. Cv., chap. 37, v. 96, vv. 189-198; chap. 38, v. 58; chap. 44, v. 48; chap. 49, v. 77; E.Z., vol. I, pp. 51-52.

2. Cv., chap. 37, vv. 66-89. The author of the Cūḷavaṁsa says that this festival was held by the kings even in his day (thirteenth century) following the decree of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (Cv., chap. 37, v. 89).

3. Cv., chap. 37, v. 207; chap. 44, v. 44.

4. Tradition places the birth, the attainment of Highest Enlightenment and the parinibbāna of the Buddha on the day of full-moon of Vesākha (April - May). The Vesākha festival is often mentioned in the Mahāvaṁsa (Mv., chap. XXXII, v. 35; chap. XXXIV, v. 59; XXXV, v. 100; chap. XXXVI, v. 40).

5. Cv., chap. 51, v. 84.

in public but also provided common ground on which the king and his people could meet. The Saṅgha as religious preceptors played a prominent part in such ceremonies. At the conclusion of these festivals it was customary for the Saṅgha to extol the virtues of the king, even if he was not present on the occasion. Jointly the bhikkhus and the people would bless the king and transfer the merit acquired to him, thereby confirming the king's role as 'defender of the Sāsana'. Thus the Saṅgha were helpful in many ways for the king to win the goodwill of his subjects.

From the side of the Saṅgha, a close association with the king was equally advantageous to them. As pointed out earlier, the monastery of this period came to own extensive landed property and other sources of income. The preservation and the peaceful enjoyment of these monastic properties depended to a large extent on the support of the king. In this context, it was the king who safeguarded the property of the Saṅgha from the occasional threats of the laity and the officers. Apart from this, the patronage of the king was essential for the advancement of the Sāsana.[1] Therefore the Saṅgha, on their part, may

---

1. Buddha-sāsanaya da aṇasak näti-vä nir-ālamba vanne-yä 'The Buddhist religion without the 'wheel of the authority' (support of the king) would be lustreless (E.Z., vol. II, p. 227).

have seen the benefits accruing from a relationship with the king.

The relationship between the king and the Saṅgha had always been one of mutual interdependence.[1] The king extended his liberal patronage to the Saṅgha and the bhikkhus exerted their great influence with the people with the aim of making the latter attached to the king. As has been rightly observed by Geiger, their interests were too closely knitted together: 'The kingship by which the state was represented was the firmest support of the Buddhist church and the latter that of the kingship'.[2] Although the Saṅgha had a measure of autonomy, it was by no means, either in theory or practice, invulnerable to the extension of royal influence. Neither was the king, either in theory or practice, immune to the impact of the Saṅgha. The functions that the king and the Saṅgha performed were mutually complementary. They were dependent upon each other for their needs; the king acquired legitimacy from his association with the Saṅgha, and the Saṅgha

---

1. It should be noted here that the relationship between the king and the Saṅgha in Ceylon was very different from that which existed between the state and the church in medieval Europe. The Saṅgha in Ceylon never attempted to wield political power directly by themselves (See L. S. Devaraja, The Kandyan Kingdom, p. 131).

2. Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 203.

enjoyed royal support and patronage. This interdependence of the king and the Saṅgha would have been greatly helpful in maintaining a balance of power in Sinhalese society.

Another significant outcome of this close relationship between the king and the Saṅgha was the influence of Buddhist ideas on the institution of kingship in Ceylon. The proclamation of Mahinda IV (956-972) in the Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription throws considerable light on this point. In this record the king declares 'that none but Bodhisattvas[1] would become kings of Laṅkā' and that they 'received this assurance (viyāran) from the omniscient Buddha'.[2] Thus, it is clear that by about the tenth century, rulers of the Island were looked upon as Bodhisattvas[3] - men destined to be Buddhas. This, of course,

---

1. For an explanation of the term Bodhisattva see p. 228, n. 3 ; see also Har Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, pp. 4 ff; G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, vol. II, pp. 322-329.

2. . . . siri Lak hi no bosat - hu no raj vanhayi Sähä-kula kot savāniya-muni-raj-hu viyāran lad (E.Z., vol. I, p. 237). This may mean that kings can only be true kings if they possess the virtues of Bodhisattvas. The latter part seems to allude to a prophecy of the Buddha.

3. This seems to be mainly a Mahāyāna Buddhist concept. But this does not necessarily imply that Bodhisattva doctrine was limited to Mahāyāna. It prevailed also among some Theravāda schools like the Mahāsaṅghikas and Sarvāstivādins. However, the adherents of the Theravāda school in Ceylon refer in particular to one Bodhisattva. He is called Metteyya (Skt. Maitreya) who, after the lapse

does not mean that all kings were in fact Bodhisattvas but that in order to be a good king one had to possess the virtues of a Bodhisattva.

The origin of this idea can be traced back to a very early period. The first implication of this concept seems to occur in the reign of Sirisaṁghabodhi (247-249). The Mahāvaṁsa attributes the term mahāsattva, an epithet of Bodhisattvas, to Sirisaṁghabodhi who was renowned as a righteous ruler.[1] According to the Pūjāvaliya, Sirisaṁghabodhi sacrificed his own life in the hope of attaining Buddhahood.[2]

The Bodhisattva concept seems to have taken firm root in the period under consideration. Buddhadāsa (337-365)

---

of five thousand years will come to the world to preach again the 'true-doctrine' (Mv., chap. XXXII, v. 73; Geiger, C.C.M.T., p. 210). In Mahāyāna, the way to Buddha-hood is opened for all pious persons, and there are many Bodhisattvas in the world, Avalokiteśvara playing an even more important part than Metteyya. Therefore, according to this belief, pious kings could be on the way to becoming Buddhas in a future existence. As some of the virtues of a Bodhisattva co-incided with those expected of a king (wisdom, courage, compassion etc.), it is easy to understand that people in a Buddhist country thought that the king actually ought to be a Bodhisattva.

1. Mv., chap. XXXVI, v. 90.

2. The Pūjāvaliya states that Sirisaṁghabodhi, on hearing the proclamation made by Goṭhābhaya that he (the king) would grant many favours to anyone who would bring the head of Sirisaṁghabodhi, cut off his head and gave it to a peasant in the hope of attaining Buddhahood (Pūjāvaliya, p. 23).

is said to have 'lived openly before the people the life that Bodhisattvas lead'.[1] In referring to Buddhadāsa the Rājāvaliya says that he aspired to Buddhahood.[2] The ten perfections (pāramitās) which must be attained by each Bodhisattva are said to have been practised by Upatissa I (365-406).[3] In the hope of attaining Buddhahood Dhātusena (455-473) instituted a bathing festival for the Bodhi tree.[4] Aggabodhi I (571-604)[5] and Sena I (833-853)[6] are

---

1. cariyaṁ bodhisattānaṁ dassento . . . (Cv., chap. 37, v. 109).

2. Rājāvaliya, p. 54.

3. . . . pūresi rājā pāramitā dasa (Cv., chap. 37, v. 180). The mention of ten pāramitās is interesting since the earlier Mahāsaṅghika sources refer only to six.

4. Geiger translated sināṇapūjaṁ bodhissa varabodhissa kārayi as 'For the Bodhi tree of him (the Buddha) to whom was vouchsafed the highest enlightenment, he instituted a bathing festival' (Cv., chap. 38, v. 55). It is possible that the word varabodhissa has occurred here in the dative case. In Pāli, dative case is used when the sense of purpose is expressed. For instance, 'Titthatu Sugato kappaṁ bahujanahitāya, bahujanasukhāya, lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānaṁ (D.N., II, p. 104) (See A. P. Buddhadatta, The Higher Pali Course for Advanced Students, p. 138). Therefore the word varabodhissa can also mean 'to acquire Buddhahood or in order to gain Buddhahood. Hence, the translation given by Sumangala and Batuvantudawe seems to be more convincing. See Culavamsa, edited by Sumangala and Batuvantudawe, chap. 38, v. 55.

5. aggabodhigatāsayo (Cv., chap. 42, v. 1).

6. . . . bhūmindo buddhabhūmigatāsayo (Cv., chap. 50, v. 65).

also said to have aspired to the attainment of supreme enlightenment. Similarly, Sena II (853-887) 'weary of the cycle of births fixed his gaze on the highest'.[1]

The above references clearly suggest that the rulers of this period were not merely compared to Bodhisattvas, but that this idea had gained recognition among them; and that at least a few tried to uphold this ideal. The attempt made by the rulers to elevate themselves to the highest position that a layman could aspire to in the Buddhist social order indicates an advanced stage in the development of the concept of kingship in Ceylon.

The tendency towards this new concept is further revealed by the practice that emerged in the tenth century of tracing the descent of the rulers back to the lineage of the Buddha. In the reign of Dappula IV (924-935) a certain Lämäni Mihiňdu claims descent from the Śākya clan: 'the incomparable ornament of the Sähä (Śākya) race; who is the son of Udā Mahayā descended from the lineage of king Paḍu Abhā'.[2] It was through Paṇḍukābhaya that the

---

1. Cv., chap. 51, v. 5.

2. Paḍu Abhā naraniňdu parapuren ā Udā Mahayāhu urehi dā . . . Sähä kulaṭ ek-talā ṭik vä siṭi Lämäni Mihindāhu (E.Z., vol. III, pp. 222-223, lines A 15 - B 19).

Sinhalese kings traced their descent to the Śākya clan to which the Buddha belonged.[1] Mahinda IV makes this claim much clearer in one of his records by describing himself as 'the pinnacle of the illustrious Sähä clan who is descended from the lineage of Okāvas, who has come down in the succession of the great king Sudovun and who is descended from the lineage of the great king Paḍuvasdev Abhā'.[2] The Polonnaruva Pillar Inscription of Mahinda V (982-1029) also states that the king was in direct line of succession from Suddhodana, the banner of the Sähä race: 'who has come in succession from Sudonā the banner of the Sähä race in which was born the chief of the sages, the refuge of the world. . .'.[3] The rulers have thus tried to present themselves as the direct descendants of the line of the Buddha, and it is not surprising that at

---

1. The Mahāvaṁsa traces back the genealogy of Paṇḍukābhaya to the Śākya Amitodana, a brother of Suddhodana (Mv., chap. VIII, vv. 18-28). According to this work, Paṇḍu-vāsudeva, the grandfather of Paṇḍukābhaya, married the daughter of the Śākya Amitodana.

2. Siribar-Sähä-kula-kot Okāvas (parapure) n baṭ Sudovun maharaj-hu anvayen ā Paḍuvasdev-Abhā maharajhu parapuren baṭ Sirisaṅgbo-Mihind maharajhu (E.Z., vol. III, p. 227).

3. lo pilisarana munindun ipat Sähä kula kevlu Sudonā parapuren ā Lak nirind . . . (E.Z., vol. IV, pp. 62-67).

a time when they entertained the Bodhisattva ideal, they would desire also to claim a close personal relationship with the Buddha. On the other hand, as a Bodhisattva one is normally regarded as belonging to the spiritual lineage (gotra) of Lord Buddha. Bodhisattvas, in Mahāyāna, are in fact often mentioned as Buddha-suta, 'scions of Lord Buddha'.

Another important point to be noted here is the use of words which originally appertained to the Buddha and the Arahants alone in connexion with the king. In the Badulla Pillar Inscription of Udaya IV (946-954), the phrase satalosä pirinivivan vahanse 'the lord who entered the parinirvāna in the sixteenth regnal year' has been used more than once in referring to a predecessor of the king, identified as Kassapa IV.[1] A point of interest in this phrase is the use of the word pirinivi (P. parinibbuta) when speaking of the death of a king; whereas, strictly speaking, it could only be used to denote the demise of a Buddha or an Arahant - beings in their last birth. As an analogous instance may be cited the posthumous title Nirvānapada of Sūryavarman I (1002-1050). It is said that he was given the posthumous title of Nirvānapada

---

1. E.Z., vol. V, pt. II, p. 185.

'the king who has gone to Nirvāna', 'because of his leanings towards Buddhism - although this did not exclude sympathies for other sects'.[1] On the other hand, it is quite likely that the Cambodian king was called Nirvāna-pada[2] after his death in keeping with the traditions of apotheosis of the king known in ancient Cambodia.[3] Therefore, it is possible that in Ceylon, too, such words were used to denote the king as a means of elevating the institution of kingship to a position of equality with the highest stages of the Buddhist Order.

In this respect, it is of importance to take into account the phraseology used in some of the inscriptions of this period to describe the kings.[4] For instance, Dappula IV (924-935) is described in one of his records as maňgul sihasun rak-gal-tala[5] arāy vadan bera-sī nānen rupu varaṇan mand siňdä 'having ascended the plateau of

---

1. G. Coedes, The Making of South East Asia, p. 100.

2. Similarly, Suriyavarman II was worshipped under the posthumous title of Paramaviṣṇu loka 'the king who has gone to the supreme sojourn with Viṣṇu', and Jayavarman VII (1181-1218) was given the posthumous title of Mahaparamasaugata (G. Coedes, The Making of South East Asia, pp. 101, 108).

3. G. Cœdes, The Making of South East Asia, p. 104.

4. E.Z., vol. I, p. 25, p. 46; E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 137.

5. Rak-gal occurs in Sinhalese literature as the equivalent of Pāli manosilā. See, for instance, Amāvatura (Sorata's

red stone which is the pleasant and auspicious lion-throne, subdued the . . . enemies with the terrific lion-roar of his word (of command)'.[1] It is noteworthy that the same similes have been used in the Jātakas in qualifying the Buddha: manosilātale[2] sīhanādaṁ nadanto taruṇa sīho viya . . . madhura-dhamma-kathaṁ kathesi[3] 'as a young lion roaring in the plateau of red stone he preached a beautiful discourse to them'. Therefore, the use of words and similes which were usually reserved for the Buddha and the Arhants in connexion with a temporal ruler further reveals the influence of Buddhism on the institution of kingship in Ceylon.

In addition to this, some rulers of this period were compared to the Buddha. Surrounded by his eighty heroic sons who bore the names of the eighty disciples

---

edition, p. 146) where rak-gal-muṅdunehi stands for manosilātale in the Suttanipāta commentary (P.T.S. edition, vol. I, p. 223). Similarly, in the Ummagga Jātaka Colombo, 1927, p. 77) the word rat-gal (Skt. rakta-silā) occurs in place of manosilātale in the Jātakaṭṭhakathā (ed. Fausböll, vol. VI, p. 399).

1. E.Z., vol. V, pt. I, p. 139.

2. The Pāli equivalent of the Sinhalese term rak-gal or rat-gal.

3. Jātaka, I, pp. 95-96.

of the Buddha,[1] Buddhadāsa (337-365) 'shone like the Perfectly Enlightened One'.[2] Kassapa V (914-923), says the Cūlavaṁsa, 'recited the Abhidhamma with the grace of a Buddha' emulating the Bodhisattva Metteyya in the Tusita heaven.[3]

Evidence of a similar nature is found in an inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972). In this record the king claims that he erected a golden image of the Buddha at the Buḷ Atulā monastery.[4] The term tamā palaṅgi, used in this record to describe the image of the Buddha, is significant. The word palaṅga is used in the Sinhalese literary works both in the sense of 'proportion'[5] and 'similar'.[6] Therefore, if the phrase in the inscription

---

1. The disciples of the Buddha were eighty (asītisāvakā); the first of them was Sāriputta. They are mentioned, for instance, in the Chakesadhātuvaṁsa (J.P.T.S., 1885, p. 16).

2. Sāriputtādināmehi puttehi parivārito Buddhadāso sa Saṁbuddha rājā viya virocatha (Cv., chap. 37, vv. 176-177).

3. Buddhalīlāya Laṅkindo abhidhammaṁ abhāsayī (Cv., chap. 52, vv. 47-49).

4. . . . (Bu)l Atulā-veherhi suvan-muvā tamā palaṅgi Munind-pilibib kara (E.Z., vol. I, p. 223).

5. Vesaturudāsanne, ed. D. E. Hettiaratchi, p. 415; Butsaraṇa, ed. Sorata, p. 270.

6. Siyabaslakara, ed. Ñānatilaka and Ñānasīha, p. 7, v. 81.

is interpreted on this basis, it may reveal that the king erected a Buddha image which bore his own physical features or which conformed to his proportions.

It is worthwhile to note here that a similar custom existed in South East Asia. An important aspect of the apotheosis of the king in ancient Cambodia was the fashioning of images of deities with the facial features of the ruler who is identified with them. For example, Indravarman I (877-889) placed in the temple called Prah Ko three statues of Śiva with the features of his father, grand father and Jayavarman II, together with corresponding statues of Śakti in the likeness of their wives.[1] The stone faces which adorn the fifty towers of Bayon are taken to represent, at one and the same time, the Bodhisattva Lokeśvara (Avalokiteśvara) and also Jayavarman VII (1181-1218).[2] Similar rites were prevalent among the

---

1. G. Coedes, The Making of South East Asia, p. 98.

2. 'Around the year 1190, Jayavarman VII adapted the cult of the god-king to the Buddhist faith which he professed, and he also associated the secular funerary cult with the worship of the Bodhisattva Lokeśvara, which he particularly favoured, this being facilitated by the rites of apotheosis connected with the worship of the Bodhisattva' (G. Coedes, The Making of South East Asia, pp. 108-109). See also G. Coedes, 'La destination funéraire des grands monuments khmérs', B.E.F.E.O., XL (1940), pp. 315-344; P. Mus, Compte rendu de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (Sitting of the 21st February), 1936.

Hindu kings of Eastern Java.[1] Therefore, it is not unlikely that an analogous practice existed in Ceylon, too. It is possible that Mahinda IV erected an image of the Buddha conforming to his features in accordance with such a custom existingin his time. However, it is not possible to draw a conclusion on this point as the relevant passage in the inscription is not well preserved.

The Cūlavaṁsa contains references to a number of rulers of this period who erected images of the Buddha and Bodhisattvas,[2] but no clarifying evidence is available to ascertain if they were made in the likeness of those kings either with respect to their features or to their size. Nevertheless, a few rulers are reported to have adorned the Bodhisattva images with the emblems of a king,[3] and it is not unlikely that at least the images so adorned were modelled with the features of the king.[4] This may gain some measure of support by the fact that

---

1. Vogel, Buddhist Art in India, Ceylon and Java, p. 104.

2. Cv., chap. 37, v. 102, v. 201; chap. 38, v. 65; chap. 41, v. 94; chap. 45, v. 62; chap. 48, v. 139; chap. 51, v. 77.

3. Cv., chap. 38, v. 68; chap. 48, v. 137.

4. Generally, Bodhisattva images are in royal attire.

the Bodhisattva image at Wäligama in the Southern Province, which is decked with the royal ornaments, bears also the features of a king.[1] The Bodhisattva image at the Ruvanväli Dāgäba at Anurādhapura is popularly known as a representation of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi.[2] The fashioning of Bodhisattva images with the features of the king may indicate an attempt to identify the king with the Buddha or his counterpart, i.e., the Cakkavatti. The Buddha and the Cakkavatti ruler, the ideal Buddhist king, are regarded almost equally in the suttas. The Cakkavatti has almost all the characteristics of a Buddha like the marks of 'great men' (mahāpurisa-lakkhaṇa). As in the case of the Buddha, the places where a Cakkavatti was born, crowned, where he wins his most significant victory and where he passes away, are declared to be 'memorable'. The funeral of the Cakkavatti must be carried out exactly in the same way as that of the Buddha. And after the cremation, a stūpa is to be raised over the relics of his body as in the case of a Buddha, visits and homage to the stūpa of

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Mahāyānism in Ceylon', C.J.Sc. (Section G), vol. II, p. 49.

2. S. Paranavitana, Sinhalayo, p. 31.

a Cakkavatti being declared to be a pious act.[1] Therefore, if the kings represented themselves as Cakkavatti rulers, it is not surprising that they erected Bodhisattva images conforming to their features. The same concept perhaps also accounts for the comparison made between the Buddha and some of the rulers of this period.[2] At least a few rulers of the period under survey are given the title Cakkavatti in the Cūḷavaṁsa. Aggabodhi I (571-604) is compared to a Cakkavatti in royal virtues.[3] The term Dhammika, used also as an epithet of Cakkavatti,[4] is applied in the Cūḷavaṁsa to Mahinda III (801-804).[5] Similarly, Aggabodhi IV (667-683) was known by the title of Dhammarāja[6] which also appears to be a designation of

---

1. Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol. I (1885), pp. 76-77; Dīgha Nikāya, vol. II (1903), pp. 142-143; vol. III, pp. 58-80; Majjhima Nikāya, vol. II, p. 134; vol. III, p. 65.

2. See pp. 300-301 above.

3. rājadhammehi rajjehi Cakkavatti narissaro (Cv., chap. 42, v. 5).

4. B. G. Gokhale, 'Dhammiko Dhammarājā', Indica (Bombay, 1953), pp. 161-165; B. G. Gokhale, 'Early Buddhist kingship', Journal of Asian Studies, vol. XXVI (1966), p. 20.

5. So Dhammikasilāmegho iccāsi dharaṇītale (Cv., chap. 49, v. 39).

6. Dhammarājā ayaṁ āsi (Cv., chap. 46, v. 2).

Cakkavatti.[1] But on the other hand, a similar title - Dharmamahārāja - prevailed among the Pallava rulers in South India. As there was a close connexion between the two countries during the period under survey,[2] it is also likely that the title Dhammarāja indicates Pallava influence. However, there is no sufficient evidence to say that the concept of Cakkavatti was well-established among the rulers of the period under consideration.[3] But the little evidence that is available points out yet another stage in the development of the concept of kingship in Ceylon.

From the discussion above, it becomes clear the great impact Buddhism had on the institution of kingship in Ceylon. And, it was the Buddhist Saṅgha which played the main role in the spread of Buddhist ideas in Sinhalese society, particularly among the royalty.

The influence of the Saṅgha on the other hand, was a discouragement to the divinity of kings in Ceylon. Nevertheless, there are numerous examples in literary and epigraphic sources where kings are compared with Hindu

---

1. For the concept of Dhammiko Dhammarājā, see B. G. Gokhale, 'Dhammiko Dhammarājā', Indica (Bombay, 1953), pp. 161-165.

2. U.H.C., vol. I, pt. I, pp. 273-274; 316-317.

3. Later centuries saw the development of this concept.

deities like Viṣṇu, Vessavaṇa and Sakka[1] in might and magnificience. Mānavamma's (684-718) bravery is like that of Viṣṇu in the battle of the gods with the demons.[2] Buddhadāsa (337-365) protected the city of Anurādhapura 'as the wealthy Vessavaṇa protects the town of Ālakamandā'.[3] Similarly, Kassapa I (473-491),[4] Aggabodhi I (571-604),[5] Kassapa V (914-923)[6] and Mahinda IV (956-972)[7] are compared to Kuvera, the god of wealth. Buddhadāsa, at the head of his army, is compared to Vāsava, at the head of the gods,[8] and Moggallāna (491-508), brother and successor of

---

1. Sakka functions very often in the Buddhist literature and appears to be more or less a Buddhist god (T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, pt. II, p. 294 ff.). See also Gananath Obeysekera, 'The Buddhist Pantheon in Ceylon and its existence', Anthropological Studies in Theravada Buddhism, 1966, pp. 1-26.

2. Cv., chap. 47, v. 25. Viṣṇu is referred to here by the epithet, Nārāyaṇa. See A. P. Buddhadatta, 'Some corrections of Geiger's Cūḷavaṁsa Translation', U.C.R., vol. VIII, no. 2, 1950, pp. 96-109.

3. rakkhaṁ Ālakamandaṁ va puraṁ Vessavaṇo dhanī (Cv., chap. 37, v. 106).

4. . . . Kuvero va tahiṁ vasi (Cv., chap. 39, v. 5).

5. . . . atthena ca dhanissaraṁ (Cv., chap. 42, v. 4).

6. Cv., chap. 52, v. 38.

7. E.Z., vol. I, p. 225.

8. . . . saddhiṁ gacchati senāya devehi viya Vāsavo (Cv., chap. 37, v. 151).

Kassapa, to the same god who fares forth to fight the demons.[1] Similarly, Kassapa V is likened to Sakka, the king of the gods.[2] A point of interest is that most of the gods with whom the kings are compared, are in fact Lokapālas, the great guardian gods of the world - just as the king is a protector of the earth they are the protectors of the celestial world - an apt comparison.

Apart from being compared to gods, there is no conclusive evidence to say that the rulers of this period proclaimed themselves to be the embodiment of a god. As pointed out above, things and qualities proper to a king are frequently compared to those proper to a god. But mere comparison to gods does not necessarily prove that the kings represented themselves as gods. Unlike their successors,[3] the rulers of the period under survey do not seem to have made any claim to identify themselves with gods. However, Paranavitana has expounded the theory that it was to set himself up as a god-king that

---

1. Cv., chap. 39, v. 23.

2. Cv., chap. 52, v. 54.

3. Niśśaṅkamalla proclaims in his Galpota Slab Inscription 'that though kings appear in human form, they are human divinities (naradevatā) and must, therefore, be regarded as gods' (E.Z., vol. II, p. 115). See also E.Z., vol. II, p. 163.

Kassapa had a remarkable palace built on the summit of Sīgiriya. According to his view, Kassapa identified himself with Kuvera, and his palace on the Sīgiri rock was meant to be a representation of Alakā, the Himālayan abode of the God of Wealth.[1] Paranavitana has also adduced many arguments in support of his theory. But, many scholars are of opinion that the theory put forward by Paranavitana is untenable.[2] As pointed out by them, it is not easy to disregard the accepted tradition that Sīgiriya was built by Kassapa as a stronghold to defend himself against Moggallāna.[3] The validity of Paranavitana's hypothesis cannot be determined unless more excavations are carried out at Sīgiriya and epigraphic evidence is found to support his view. However, if any credence is

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, pp. 129-183; also cf. 'Some Aspects of the Divinity of the king in Ancient India and Ceylon', Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference, 16th session, October, 1951, vol. II, pp. 217-232.

2. S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, pp. 163-168; Rhys Davids, 'Sīgiri, the Lion Rock near Pulastipura Ceylon and the 39th chapter of the Mahāvaṁsa', J.R.A.S., new series, vol. VII, 1875, pp. 191-209; Martin Wickremasinghe, 'Sīgiriya, fortress or abode of a God-king?', New Lanka, vol. I, no. 4, July 1950, pp. 39-44.

3. S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, pp. 165, 167; Cv., chap. 39, v. 2.

given to the thesis of Paranavitana, it would appear that Kassapa identified himself with Kuvera and that the palace of Sīgiri was built with the purpose of creating a miniature model of Kuvera's abode, Ālakamandā or Alakā.

Even if Kassapa represented himself as a god-king, he may not have received the favour of his people or the Saṅgha in promoting this idea. As Raghavan points out, if a king wishes to be a god-king, it is not sufficient that he proclaims himself or prides himself to be a god-king. The essential factor is the popular recognition.[1] Yet, Kassapa alienated the sympathy of his subjects by putting his father to death in a most inhuman manner.[2] Furthermore, it is rather unlikely that he had the assent of the Saṅgha, especially of the Mahāvihāra fraternity, in his claim to divinity. The Theravāda school of Buddhism, to the tenets of which the Mahāvihāra adhered with unswerving fidelity, did not countenance the doctrine of the divinity of the king.[3] Therefore, if Kassapa

---

1. S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, p. 163.

2. Cv., chap. 38, vv. 105-111.

3. The story of the primeval king, Mahāsammata, given in the Aggañña Sutta (Dīgha Nikāya, vol. III, pp. 84-95) is clearly designed to expound that the king derives his power from the people. The Mahāyāna schools were also opposed to the doctrine of the divinity of the

assumed such divine powers as suggested by Paranavitana, he would certainly have lacked the support of the Mahāvihāra fraternity. Perhaps this is made clear by certain events that took place in the reign of Kassapa. On one occasion the bhikkhus of the Mahāvihāra refused to accept the gift of the enlarged and improved Issarasamaṇa monastery offered to them by Kassapa.[1] When Moggallāna declared war against Kassapa, they supported the former by allowing him to collect his troops at a vihāra.[2] After Moggallāna's victory, the Mahāvihāra-bhikkhus received him ceremoniously at the Mahāvihāra.[3] The opposition of the Mahāvihāra ultimately led to the disaster of Kassapa.[4] Therefore, Kassapa's attempt to establish his position by representing himself as a god-king, if he actually did so as inferred by Paranavitana, does not seem to have

---

king (Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. III, 1908, p. 461). But at a later date they seem to have partly accepted it (Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra, Kyoto, 1931, p. 125).

1. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 10-12. It is possible, as suggested by Paranavitana, that Mahāvihāra refused this gift of Kassapa because they were against his new doctrine (S. Paranavitana, 'Sīgiri, the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, pp. 156-158). However, according to the Cūḷavaṁsa, they refused it because he was a patricide.

2. Cv., chap. 39, v. 21.

3. Cv., chap. 39, vv. 29-32.

4. S. Paranavitana, op. cit., p. 178.

been successful.

The same line of reasoning may explain why no king after Kassapa ever thought of making Sīgiri a royal abode. They may have feared the antagonism of the Mahā-vihāra fraternity. In his essay, Paranavitana rightly points out that 'if it was remembered for some centuries after Moggallāna that Sīgiri was associated with certain politico-religious doctrine, the espousal of which did no good to an earlier ruler, no subsequent monarch would have cared to risk his throne by courting the displeasure of the powerful Mahāvihāra fraternity'.[1] Therefore, it may not be unreasonable to assume that the influence of the Saṅgha was a great obstacle to the diffusion of the doctrine of the divinity of the king in Ceylon.

Even if it is accepted that Kassapa assumed divine honours, this does not necessarily prove that these ideas were widely prevalent in Ceylon. Kassapa may have had special reasons to claim such power, if he actually did so, and therefore he can be regarded as an exception rather than the rule. As pointed out above, no king after Kassapa attempted to emulate him.

The doctrine of the divinity of kingship was considerably modified in Ceylon owing to the influence of

---

1. S. Paranavitana, op. cit., p. 159.

Buddhism. The Buddhists conceived the king as a being elected by the people to safeguard society from anarchy. The great Buddhist philosopher Āryadeva (second century), who is said to have been the son of a Ceylon ruler, uses the following words in addressing a king: 'What pride should there be for you, the servant of the community, maintained by one-sixth share (of the produce of the land)'.[1] The story of Mahāsammata given in the Aggañña Sutta[2] is clearly designed to expound that the king derives his power from the people. This concept carried most weight in Ceylon as is seen in the eighth or ninth century work the Vaṁsatthappakāsinī,[3] the eighteenth century treatise Lak Raja Lō Sirita[4] and the nineteenth century work the Nīti Nighaṇḍuva.[5] The ceremonies connected with the consecration of a king in ancient Ceylon, as detailed in the commentary of the Mahāvaṁsa, are based on the same conception and differ considerably

---

1. Gaṇadāsasya te darpaḥ ṣaḍ-bhāgena bhṛtasya kaḥ catuḥśatikā (Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. III (1908), p. 461).

2. Dīgha Nikāya, vol. III, pp. 84-95.

3. Vpk., vol. I, p. 122.

4. Lak Raja Lō Sirita, British Museum, palm-leaf Ms., OR 6603 (65) 665, leaf 11.

5. Nīti Nighaṇḍuva, pp. 3-5.

from the rituals observed at the abhiṣeka and the rājasūya, as they are laid down in detail in the Brāhmaṇas.[1] The very act of consecration was considered in ancient India to confer upon the king some divine power. It is explicitly stated in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that 'he who is consecrated draws nigh to the gods and becomes one of the deities'.[2] But the rites connected with the abhiṣeka ceremony in Ceylon do not carry any evidence to show that it was designed to invest the king with divine powers.[3]

From the details given above, it may become clear that the concept of divine kingship was not prevalent in the period under review. Instead, by about the tenth century the idea of a Bodhisattva-king became predominant as is evidenced by the Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV. The Saṅgha, as pointed out above, undoubtedly played a significant role in the establishment of such ideas in the Sinhalese society and inducing the royalty to abide by them.

---

1. See pp. 151-155; N. N. Law, Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, pp. 159 ff. and 168 ff.

2. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, trans. Eggeling, pt. II, p. 4.

3. See pp. 137-176; also see Vpk., vol. I, pp. 305-306; Sāratthadīpanī (Sinhalese edition, 1914), p. 140; John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants, pp. 158-164.

CONCLUSION

The most characteristic feature of the institution of kingship in the period under survey is that it evolved mainly under the influence of Buddhist concepts. Like most other institutions of the Island, kingship drew its inspiration mainly from Buddhist sources, and almost every aspect of kingship in Ceylon, particularly during the period under review, signifies this religious feature.

The influence of the Saṅgha is mainly reflected in their incessant efforts to promulgate Buddhist ideas and ideals among the royalty. Almost all the rulers of this period, like their predecessors, maintained a close relationship with the Saṅgha and seem to have taken a particular interest in strengthening this connexion to the maximum extent possible. They even went to the extent of transferring certain economic and political rights in favour of the Saṅgha.

The close connexion between the king and the Saṅgha had a considerable effect on the development of the concept of kingship in Ceylon. One of the politically most potent ideas to emerge from this relationship

was the notion that only a Buddhist, nay a Bodhisattva, could become king of Ceylon. The position of the king was 'legitimized' and strengthened by the sanction of the Saṅgha and raised to the highest place in Buddhist ideology. On the other hand, the Saṅgha strongly discouraged the diffusion of the doctrine of the divinity of kingship in Ceylon. No ruler of this period claimed to be the embodiment of a god; instead, they appear to have been represented as Bodhisattvas.

The profound influence of Buddhism on the institution of kingship is reflected in the concepts relating to the king's duties and functions. Kings were expected to rule the country in accordance with the tenfold royal virtues (dasarājadhamma) and to win over their subjects by fulfilling the four heart-winning qualities (cattāri saṁgahavatthūni). In addition to this, they were enjoined to perform in perpetuity the ten meritorious deeds (dasa puñña-kiriya). Similar concepts are expounded in the Jātaka stories. In fact the ideals set before the rulers of the Island represent nothing else but the path of righteousness prescribed by Buddhist theorists as exemplified in the Jātakas and other canonical works.

The ceremony of the inauguration of kings displays a distinct Buddhist character. The rulers of our period

appear to have made a special promise to protect the Saṅgha and the Sāsana at the time when they underwent the abhiṣeka ceremony. The wearing of the white scarf at the time of their abhiṣeka probably signifies a religious rite connected with this assurance.

Another significant feature of the abhiṣeka ceremony of this period is the importance attached to the crown. By about the eighth century the custom of sprinkling consecrated water on the head of the king seems to have become obsolete and, instead, the coronation gained importance as the main rite in the consecration of kings. This may indicate another stage in the evolution of kingship in Ceylon: the crown symbolized the superiority and magnificence of the king. In order to be a legitimate ruler it was necessary for the king to be consecrated according to rites that had been handed down by tradition, and to be in possession of the regalia. If a king failed to do so, he did not become entitled to the titles of raja and maharaja.

The royal titles, throne names and even the personal names of the kings of this period seem to have a clear religious significance. Some of the rulers bore the title of 'Budadasa' (Buddhadāsa), indicating that the kings, as a rule, wished to be known as devoted followers of the Buddhist faith. The throne name 'Siri-saṁghabodhi' borne

by many rulers of our period also symbolizes their attachment to the Saṅgha and the Sāsana. Apart from this, almost all the rulers of the period under review bore names of Buddhist origin; a custom not followed by their predecessors.

In addition, the kings of the period under consideration claimed to be descendants of the Śākya clan, into which the Buddha was born. This claim would have strengthened the rights of the Sinhalese kings by presenting them as the direct descendants of the Buddha. It was but fit and proper that 'the descendants of the line of the Buddha' should rule the land which 'belonged to the Sāsana'.

The Buddhist influence on the institution of kingship in Ceylon is thus predominant. On the other hand, there is also clear evidence for the influence of Hindu ideas on the political institutions in Ceylon, as long as they were not in conflict with the Buddhist concept of kingship. The foregoing also reveals the attempt made by the rulers of this period to consolidate their power by forming a close link with the Saṅgha and the Sāsana. The claim of the kings to be Bodhisattvas and descendants of the line of the Buddha holding an office blessed by the Saṅgha would have been greatly helpful in strengthening their position among the people who were mostly Buddhists.

Moreover, these ideas would have been particularly useful for the rulers to unite the people in support of their dynasty whenever there were invasions from Hindu kingdoms of South India.

The kings of this period figure as paramount lords of the Island. They held sway over the whole Island although there were times when this authority was challenged by certain rulers in Rohaṇa. They no longer used titles indicative of their humble origin but adorned themselves with high-sounding epithets. The 'military leaders of one time' had by the tenth century elevated themselves to the highest stage in the Buddhist ideology - claiming to be Bodhisattvas - men striving to become Buddhas.

The king was assisted in the onerous task of government by the members of the royal family in addition to other state officers. Almost all the highest and important positions of state were held by the close relatives of the king. The royal princes were entrusted with the administration of important provinces of the state such as Rohaṇa and Dakkhiṇadesa, a procedure which was not only helpful for the king to consolidate his authority over those provinces but also to establish his position as the paramount ruler of the Island. In addition, this gave an opportunity for the princes to gain experience in administration

which would prove useful when they would accede to the throne at a later date. It should be noted, however, that this arrangement functioned well only when there was unity in the royal family but when differences arose it easily led to civil war and disruption.

The titles bestowed on the members of the royal family also indicate the growth of kingly power. In the early Brāhmī inscriptions, royal princesses refer to themselves as upāsikās 'lay-devotees', just as people in ordinary stations in life, who had no distinctive epithet to prefix to their names, are given the epithet of upāsaka or upāsikā. But such humble epithets were not used to denote the royal princesses of this period; instead, they were conferred with the official title of rājinī. Similarly royal princes were given the title of ādipāda or āpā.

Kingship was hereditary in a family which, by common consent, was considered to be of Kṣatriya lineage. To be eligible to the throne, a prince had to be of the proper lineage on the mother's as well as on the father's side. Succession disputes were not unknown, but generally the rights of the eldest surviving male members of the family were respected, and the choice of the yuvarāja during the lifetime of the reigning monarch diminished the

chances of dispute.

The rights and functions of the king were of the highest and most extensive nature; in theory he was the acknowledged lord of the soil; he alone taxed the people and determined the services they were to perform; all offices of state were at his disposal, and all honours as well as power emanated from him and were enjoyed only during his pleasure. This absolute power, which the king possessed in theory, was, however, limited to a great extent in practice by various modifying factors. Almost all the members of the royal family shared in the administration as far as possible and had opportunities of influencing the king's policy; some were even powerful enough to challenge the authority of the king. Then there were the high officials of the state, some of whose offices were hereditary and who commanded the respect of the king by their descent, ability and character.

More important as a check on arbitrary power seems to have been the existence of a set of norms of conduct for the rulers. The king was expected to follow the customary laws which emphasized the qualities of justice, mercy, mildness and patience; and to make his actions conducive to the good of the people. It is noteworthy that in the Cūḷavaṁsa it has been said of many rulers that in their actions they followed former kings, and that they did not deviate from

the path of tradition. There were nevertheless some rulers who deviated from this path to a greater or lesser extent. The selfish cruelty shown by Kassapa alone would illustrate that the influence of moral and spiritual precepts was not as great as the authors of the chronicles could have wished. Most rulers of this period gained power by overthrowing the ruling monarch; civil wars, succession disputes and dynastic dissensions were frequent during this period. Therefore, how far the kings followed these principles must have been dependent on the individual's attitude.

In general, however, the influence of the Saṅgha constitutes a considerable check on the abuse of royal power. The Saṅgha had easy access to the royalty; they acted as their advisers, educators and mediators. Moreover, the employment of mercenary troops in the army; the power and influence wielded by the senāpati as the commander of the armed forces; popular opinion and the way it was manifested against the kings who infringed established laws; the existence of two rival parties for the throne - all these went far to reduce any tendency towards arbitrary and despotic exercise of power of the king. Therefore it may be concluded that kingship as it functioned in Ceylon, particularly during the period under consideration, was neither absolute nor despotic.

APPENDIX I

'What ceremonies are observed at the coronation of a king?' asked Governor Von Falk in 1769 and the answer given by 'some of the best-informed Kandyan Buddhist monks' appears to be a summary of the interesting description given in the Sinhalese commentary of that portion of the Majjhima Nikāya known as Culla sīhanāda suttavaṇṇanā and quoted in the Mahāvaṁsa Ṭīkā. Both summary and description are given below in parallel colomns:-

Summary[1]	Description[2]
On the day of his installation, the Royal Maṇḍapa (pavilion)is beautifully decorated with all sorts of precious ornaments; within that Maṇḍapa is erected another, made of the branches of the Udumbara[3]or Aṭṭika tree; and in the centre of this inner Maṇḍapa is placed a seat,	In the first place, he who wishes to be duly inaugurated as king should obtain for this purpose three chanks (golden and otherwise), water from the Ganges river, and a maiden of the Kṣatriya race, He must himself be ripe for the ceremony(i. e., be over sixteen years of age) and be a Kṣatriya of noble

1. A.Bertolacci, Ceylon, Appendix A, pp. 454-455.
2. Mahāvaṁsa Ṭīkā, vol. I, pp. 305-306; trans. C.M.Fernando, J.R.A.S.C.B., XIV, no. 47, 1896, pp. 126-127; reproduced H.Ellawala, Social History of Early Ceylon, pp. 22-23.
3. Fig tree(Ficus glomerata).

made of the wood of the same tree:- he who is suited for the kingship, covered with jewels, and invested with the insignia of royalty, wearing the sword, the pearl umbrella, the forehead band, the slippers, and the chowrie made of the white hairs of the Semara's tail, repairs to the above mentioned seat:- a royal virgin, adorned with costly ornaments and holding in her hand/a sea-chank filled with Ganges water and opening to the right, then approaches the place where the king is seated, and lifting up the chank with both hands, pours its contents upon the king's head, addressing him, at the same time, in these words: 'Your Majesty is anointed to rule over this whole assembly of Kṣatriyas; may it therefore please Your Majesty to perform the duties of a sovereign, and to exercise your sway with benignity and lineage, and must sit on a splendid Udumbara chair, well set in the middle of the pavilion made of Udumbara branches, which is itself in the interior of a hall gaily decked for the ceremony of abhiṣeka. First of all, the Kṣatriya maiden of gentle race, clothed in festive attire, taking in both hands a right handed sea-chank, filled with Ganges water, and raising it aloft, pours the abhiṣeka water over his head and says as follows:- 'Sire, by this ceremony of abhiṣeka all the people of the Kṣatriya race make thee their Mahārāja for their protection. Do thou rule over the land in uprightness, and imbued with the ten royal virtues. Have thou for the Kṣatriya race a heart filled with paternal love and solicitude. Let them(in return)protect, and guard, and cherish thee.' Next, the royal chaplain, splendidly attired in a

justice.' After this, the Purohita(the Head Brāhamin), arrayed with ornaments adapted to the nature of his office, lifts up with both hands, a silver chank filled with Ganges water, and pouring its contents on the king's head, addresses him in the manner above mentioned, and recommends him to govern with gentleness and justice. Then a principal Siṭa, adorned with suitable ornaments, taking up with both hands a golden chank, like wise filled with river water, pours the contents upon the king's head, admonishes him to reign with justice and gentleness, and to perform the established duties of a sovereign. These ceremonies being ended, and the king invested with the crown, the following reflections ought to present themselves to his royal mind:- The addresses which have been just now made to me may be construed either as an imprecation manner befitting his office, taking in both hands a silver chank filled with Ganges water, and raising it aloft, pours the abhiseka water over his head, and says as follows: 'Sire, by this ceremony of abhiseka all the people of the Brāmin race make thee their Mahārāja for their protection. Do thou rule over the land in uprightness, and imbued with the ten royal virtues. Have thou for the Brāhmin race a heart filled with paternal love and solicitude. Let them(in return)protect, and guard, and cherish thee." Next, he who holds the office of Setthi, attired in a suitable manner, taking in both hands a golden chank filled with Ganges water, and raising it aloft, pours the abhiṣeka water over his head, and says as follows: 'Sire, by this ceremony of abhiṣeka all the Gahapatis, for their protection make thee their Mahārāja. Do thou rule over the land in

or as a blessing; and I am to consider the substance and actual purpot of them to be to the following effect: 'If Your Majesty act in conformity to our suggestions, it is well; otherwise it is to be hoped that your head will split into seven pieces."

uprightness and imbued with the ten royal virtues. Have thou for the Gahapati race a heart filled with paternal love and solicitude. Let them(in return)protect, and guard, and cherish thee.' Those who address the above form of words pronounce, as it were, a curse upon the king, as if they should say, 'It is meant that thou shouldst rule the land in accordance with these our words. Should it not be so, mayest thy head split in seven pieces.'

APPENDIX II

DAVY'S ACCOUNT OF THE CORONATION OF A SINHALESE KING[1]

On the death of a king, the ministers having issued a report that his majesty was ill, they assembled to deliberate respecting his successor, and to send orders for the principal people of the raṭas, who were entitled to be consulted on the election of a new monarch, to appear at Kandy.

Having come to a determination, the ministers directed a guard to be mounted before the house of the successor whom they had chosen; and this was the first public intimation of the important business in agitation. Their next step was to collect the chiefs, and inform them that the king was ill, and that it was right to be prepared for the worst that might happen. If there were an heir to the throne, about whose succession there could be no dispute, the chiefs remarked, 'Such an one is heir apparent, we need not to be consulted;"-if not, they observed, 'We leave it to the maha-nilamēs to make choice of a proper person.' Then the adhikāramas named the successor they had in view, and obtained the unanimous consent of the chiefs to his election.

---

1. John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants, pp. 158-164.

Having done with the chiefs, they applied to the people of the different districts, sending for those of each district separately, and telling them the same story about the sickness of the king, and the necessity of being prepared for the event, should it prove unfortunate. The people, paying the greatest deference to the ministers, would remark:- 'If there is a regular successor, we need not to be consulted; and if not, the maha-nilamēs are the best judges of the prince who is most likely to make a good king.' Then the prince selected was described, and one of the people of each district was sent to see him, that he might be known again, and they might be able to guard against future imposition.

The plot now opened fast; the chiefs were assembled in the hall of audience, and the people were collected before the hall. The ministers came forward and informed the assembly that the king was very sick, and that it was their wish to know what arrangements the people chose to make. Then the people replied, 'Such a one(naming the person chosen by the adhikāramas)promises to possess all the virtues of the sick king; or, is free from his faults.' To which the ministers rejoined, 'Well, remember it is your choice, do not blame us for it hereafter; we cannot refuse our assent.'

Now it was pretty well understood that the king was dead. The diyavadana nilame, and the haluvadana nilame, attended the prince, to assist him in bathing and in dressing himself in the robes and ornaments of royalty. He proceeded in the royal palanquin to the palace, and getting out at the great arch-way, ascended the steps to the daḷadā-māligāva, prostrated before the shrine, and made an offering of flowers to Buddha, to prove that he was of the established religion of the country. From the

temple he went to the adjoining pattirippuva, the hexagonal pavilion at the head of the great square. A signal being given a curtain was drawn and the prince was disclosed seated, when jingalls were fired, and tom-toms, & c. played. The chiefs in the square below, arranged according to rank, prostrated themselves three times, and then went on their knees. The prince begging them not to mind the ceremonial, they prostrated again, and at his request went on one side. Then the people of the raṭas, drawn up in lines and formed into a square, presented themselves, and the first adhikārama described the different districts to which they belonged. Now the chiefs repeated their prostrations, and were succeeded by tumblers, fencers, and dancers, who having first prostrated, performed before the prince. The chiefs having prostrated once more, the prince retired, and was conducted to the royal bed-chamber.

It was now publicly announced that the king was dead. A tent was pitched before the hall of audience, in which, on a piece of iron and a bason of mixed metal, a man stood by the side of a heap of paddy and beat the mourning tom-tom-the public signal of the event, warning the chiefs to dress themselves in black, and authorizing the people to give vent to their grief, and cry and lament aloud.

Till the body of the deceased monarch was consumed, it was contrary to custom for the prince to take any refreshment. The corpse, enclosed in a coffin, was carried in a palanquin to the avadāna-maḍuva, or royal burying ground, attended by the chiefs, their wives and daughters. As the funeral procession moved on, two women standing on a platform, carried by four men, threw rice over the coffin. The priests of the different temples of Buddha

were assembled at the burying-ground, and having offered up the proper prayer for the happiness of the deceased monarch in his metempsychosis, were presented with cloths, that were laid on the coffin, to be given them for discharging their pious office. The coffin was placed in a kind of wooden cage, and was surrounded with wood; a person broke its lid with an axe, and a relation of the deceased set fire to the pile, which was fed with oil, and pitch, and sandalwood, and various perfumes. When the whole was enveloped in flame, the chiefs retired, went to the great square, and informing the prince that the body was burnt, were ordered by him to go to their homes and purify themselves.

The mourning tom-tom was sounded, and the funeral fire was kept alive till the eleventh day, when the chiefs proceeded to the burying-ground with offerings of betel, areka-nut, and such articles of diet as might be presented to a king with propriety. The fire was now extinguished by pouring on it milk and cocoanut-water; some of the calcined bones were put into a pot or urn of earthenware, and covered and sealed, whilst the rest of the bones and ashes were collected and deposited in a grave with the presents brought for the deceased king.

The urn was placed on the head of a man masked and covered all over with black, who, holding a sword in his hand, and mounted on an elephant or horse, and attended by the chiefs, proceeded to the Mahaveli-gaňga. At the ferry called Katugastota, two small canoes made of the kakoonga were prepared, lashed together, and covered with boughs in the form of a bower. The masked bearer, entering the canoe, was drawn towards the mid-channel of the river by two men swimming; who, when they approached the deepest part of the stream, pushed the canoe forward, and hastily

retreated. Now the mask, having reached the proper station, with the sword in one hand the urn in the other, divided the urn with the sword, and in the act plunged into the stream, and diving, came up as far as possible below, and landing on the opposite side, disappeared. The canoes were allowed to float down the river; the horse or elephant was carried across, and left to graze at large, never to be used any more; and the women who threw the rice over the coffin, with the men who carried them, were also transported to the other side of the river, under the strict prohibition of recrossing. The chiefs returned to the great square, informed the prince that the ceremony was ended, and were again ordered to purify themselves. If a near relation of the deceased monarch, the prince himself put on, and ordered the court to wear, deeper mourning than before; but if not, he threw off his mourning, with the exception of a black handkerchief, which he continued to wear about his head.

Another ceremony remained to be performed before the prince could be considered completely king:- it was that of choosing a name and putting on the regal sword. It was the duty of the royal astrologers to ascertain a fortunate period for the ceremony, and invent fortunate names; each individual being required to write a name on a plate of gold, set with precious stones, and deposit it in the nāta-dēvāle. On the day fixed, which was sometimes a year or two after the election, the prince went in great state to the maha-viṣṇu-dēvāle, where he presented offerings and made prostrations to the god. Thence, he passed to the Nāta-dēvāle, and having gone through the same religious ceremony, he inspected the plates, chose the name that pleased him, and read it to the first Adikar, who proclaimed aloud,-'This is the name that the

gods have chosen for the king to bear.' Then the gold plate, the nalapata, on which the name was inscribed, was tied to the prince's forehead by a member of the Pilima Talavve family, which being of royal descent, enjoyed this privilege and that of putting on the regal sword, which was attached to a belt that passed over the shoulder and came round the waist. The sword having been girded on the prince, the kapurāla presented a pot of sandal-powder, in which the prince, who may now be called king, dipped his fingers and touched the sword; and this ceremony was performed in the Maha, as well as in the Nāta-dēvāle. From the temple, mounted on his elephant, the king went round the great square, and paraded through the illuminated streets of his capital, preceded by dancers, singers, and musicians of all kinds, and attended by his whole court, making the greatest possible display of pomp and splendour.

Coronation, it may be remarked, was not one of the ceremonies of the Kandyan monarchy, nor I believe, of the eastern courts in general; nor is a crown named amongst the essential regalia, which are, the white umbrella, the chameraga or brush made of the tail of the Tibet cow, the gold sword, the gold forehead-plate, and the golden slippers. But though not essential, the use of the crown was not prohibited, and there was a handsome one of gold set with diamonds, rubies, and emeralds, that belonged to the kings of Kandy. It was seldom worn; and a cap, from superstitious motives, was generally substituted for it,- a king imagining that, in assuming a crown, he imitated the gods(who are supposed to wear crowns), and that unless he imitated them as well in his conduct, leading ever after the most correct and irreproachable and virtuous life, he

should excite their highest displeasure, and draw down certain vengeance on his ambitious and unworthy head.

APPENDIX III

LANKĀVE RĀJASIRIT HĀ LŌKA CĀRITRA

OR

LAK RAJA LŌ SIRITA[1]

Nama Srī Ghaṇāya. Kanda Uḍa Nuvaraṭa maha rajjuruvan vahanse namak päminenṭa palamuhiṭa yedī tibena siritvū anājñāvak ädda, prathamayen ē anājñāva dunnē kavda, koyi prasthāveda, ē anājñāval liyavī tibenavāda yana mē vagaṭa?

Mē Srī Laṁkādvīpayaṭa maha rajjuruvan vahanṣē namak pahaḷavūye kesēdäyi yatahot. Mema varṣayaṭa dēdās tunsiya dolos avurudu matu Vesaṅga pura pahaḷosvak lat Aṅgaharuvādā Daṁbadiva Lāla nam raṭa Siṁhapuravara raja pämini Siṁhabāhu maha rajjuruvange kumaruvan aturen väḍimāḷu Vijaya kumārayo satsiyayak yōdhayin samaga nävu näṅgi avut mema Laṁkāvaṭa goḍa bäsa rajaśrīyaṭa päminiṇisēka. Mesē palamuven Lakdivaṭa raja päminiṇīmaṭa anājñāva dunnē kavda yat. Samatis perum purā lovuturā buduvū apagē Budurajānan vahansēya. Ē anājñāva dunnē koyi prasthāvēda kīvot. Buduvū navaveni Durutu masa pura pasalosvak lat dinayehi Daṁbadiva madhya desayen mema Lankāvaṭa ahasiṁ väḍa Laṁkā madhyayehi pihiṭi Mahanāṅga vanōddhyānayehi räsvū mahā Yakṣa sēnāvage maddhayehi ahasē väḍa siṭa taman vahansēgē ānubhāvayen Giri nam divayina genvā Yakṣayan ehi pihiṭuvā palamu tibū

---

1. British Museum, palm-leaf MS., OR 6603(65)665.

stānayaṭama yavā e prasthāvaṭa mē Lakdiva manuṣyayō näti seyin etänhi räsvū mahat dēvasamāgamayaṭa bana vadārā ovun saraṇa sīlayehi pihiṭuvā mē divayina matu manuṣyāvāsa vena lesaṭa ārakṣākara nävata Daṁbadivaṭa väḍiseka. Mesē loväḍaśadu Budurajānan vahansē satalis auruddhak buduva väḍasiṭa piriniva pānā dinayehi Daṁbadiva Kusinārā nuvara Mallava rājayangē magul uyanehi pänavū srīyahanhī śatapī hiṁda dasa dahasak sakvalin etänhi räsvu deviyan aturen svamīpayehi siṭi Śakra divyarājayāṭa vadāraṇa sēka. Śakraya māgē säsanaya matu Lankādvīpayehi pihiṭannēya. Eyin Daṁbadiva Lāla nam nuvaraṭa Siṁha nam purayehi raja pämini Siṁhabāhu rajjuruvaṅge jeṣṭa putravū Vijaya nam rājakumāra kenek satsiyayak yodha ämatiyan hā samaga ada davasa Lankāvaṭa goḍabäsa rājjayaṭa päminennēya. Esē heyin pirisa sahitavū . . . rajjuruvanda Lankāvada hoṁdahäṭi rakṣākaravayi anājñā dunsēka. Budungē anājñā lat Sakdevraju Viṣṇu divyarājayā käṁdavā Utphalavarnna pirivara sahitavū Vijaya kumārayanda pandahasak avrudu Lakdiva matu pavatnāvū Buddha śāsanayada manā koṭa rakṣā karavayi anājñā kaleya. E anājñā lat deviput Lakdivaṭa bäsa emalesaṭa ārakṣā kaleya. Mesē Budungē deviyangē anājñāven Sūrya vaṅśayehi pahalavū Vijaya rajjuruvō prathamayen mema Lakdiva Thāṁbraparnnī nam nuvara aṭatis auruddhak rājjya kalāha. Tavada srī Buddha varṣayen dedās tunsiya dolos avruddaṭa pämini mē varṣaya dakvā prathama raja pämini Vijaya rajjuruvan paṭan dänaṭa raja karana Kīrtti Srī Rājasiṁha maha rajjuruvan antīma koṭa medätura raja kala maha rajjuruvan vahansēla ekasiya hättä nama denekäyi data yutu.

Rajjuruvan vahansē namak ukutvamava vadālāma devanu rajjuruvan vahansē namak rājjayaṭa pamunuvannē koyi häṭida yanaya vacanayaṭa?

Rajjuruvan vahansē namak ukutveṅḍa palamuven kumāra kenek ätnam amāptya maṅḍalayā hā samaga ohuṭa rājjaya bhāra karaṅḍa puḷuvana. Esē nätuva rajjuruvo ukutva vadālot amāptya maṅḍalayā visin rajavaṅśayen kenek mē Lakdiva ätnam soyā rajakamaṭa tabāgannavāya. Esē nätnam Buddhāṅgamaya saha Sūryavaṅśaya pavatinā Mudhurā puraya ādīvū venat desavalaṭa däkun paṅḍuru yavā raja kumariyan saha raja kumaruvan genvāgana rajakamaṭa tibā ġanīma purātäna paṭan Mahanuvara sirit hätiya. Esē noyaduna nam Baṅḍāravaliyen kenen rajakamaṭa pamunuvanavōya.

Rajjuruvan vahansē namakaṭa kumāravaru kīpadenek ätnam eyin väḍimāḷu kumārayā ära bāla kumāra kenekuṅḍa rājjaya pamunuvaṅḍat puḷuvanvū anājñāvakut ätuvāda yana mēvagaṭa?

Rājakumāravarungē väḍimahaḷu bāla pilivela rajakamaṭa niyamayak novèyi. Rajakamaṭa niyamaya nam guna nuvana pin ätibavaya. Mē Lakdiva Anurādhapura nuvara raja pämini Mutāsiva maharajjuruvangē kumaravaru dasadenagen deveniva upan kumārayā mahatvū gunanuvana punyānubhāvayen yukta bävin väḍimahaḷu kumārayā sitiyadī rājaśriyaṭa päminavūha. Mēvaga Rājaratnākareya yana potē penī äti. Piyarajjuruvo ätat nätat karaṅḍa sirit häṭi mēlesaya nohot piyarajjuruvaṅḍa kämati kumāra kenekuṅḍa rājjaya pamunuvaṅḍat puḷuvana. . . . . .

Devanuva mema rajjuruvan vahansēgē tani kämättaṭa ōnävū deyak karaṅḍa puḷuvanvāda yana mē äsīmaṭa?

Rajjuruvan vahansē lōkanītiya yana purātäna pävati naḍu anaḍu sirit cāritra dänīmada dharmmanītiya yana āgama purāgama dänīmada mesē mahatvū nuvana äti paṅḍitakenek nam tamange kämättaṭa tīndu karaṅḍa puḷuvan rājje kāraṇavaḷut äta. Amāptamaṅḍalayāgenda raṭavāsīngenda hoṅda häṭi vicārā

karaṇadet bohosēma äta. Edēsēkanam mē Lakdiva Polonnaru pura nuvara raja pämini Pākramabāhu maharajjuruvan vahansēgē kämättaṭa kaladēt amāptamaṅḍalayāgen vicārā kaladēt Mahavahansē yana potē äta.

Raṭa ānḍukirīme anājñāvalin ema rajjuruvan vahansēt häsireṅḍa ōnāvū anājñāvalut ädda yana mē vagaṭa?

'Rājjassya imūlaṁ indriyejayaṁ' kiyā Nītiśāstrayehi mulaṭama däkvūheyin raṭa āṅḍukirīmaṭa mulvūyē pañcēndriyaṇ jayagämmaya. Pañcēndriyo nam äsaya kaṇaya näsaya divaya äṅgaya yana mē pasayi. Movungē jayagämmenam äsin duṭu ansatu strī ādi vastuvaṭada kanin asana kelām ādi napuru tepulvalaṭada mekīdēṭa noälīmaya, nokipīmaya, näsayaṭa dänena suganddhayaṭada, divaṭa dänena rasayaṭada äṅgaṭa dänena śapayaṭada noälīmaya yana mē pañcendriyayangē jayagämmayi. Mē pasiṅduraṅgē jaya gämmanīmaṭa mulvūyē ācārayin nohot ācāri nam mavupiya gurukula deṭu ādin pavatinā sirit cāritrayi. E ācārayaṭa mulvūyē nuvanättan sēvanaya kirīmay. Ēṭa mulvūyē śasta(tra)iganīmayi. Śāstra igänīmen tamā samurddha karannēya. E śāstra jñāṇayen yuktabavaṭa pamunuvā sita jayagatte nam vannēya. Tamāgē sita jayagattē siyalu abhimatārttha siddhavanu läbē. Mē rajjuruvan vahansēlā visin häsireṅḍa yutu siritvū anājñāvalya. Mīṭa oppinna Telpātrā Jātakeya yana pote penī äta.

Mema rajjuruvan vahansē visin yam kenekuṅgē äsin bäḷum nätuva mohu mē värädda kalāya yana vaga kenekuṅḍa nokiyā emarajjuruvan vahansēgē tani kämättaṭa miṇihek maravaṅḍa kenekuṅgē vastuva hāni karaṅḍa puḷuvanvāda yana mē äsīmaṭa?

Pasuunu kālayehida matuena kālayehida dän pavatinā kālayehida yandēsayaka yanraṭaka yannuvaraka rajjuruvan

vahansē namak amāptavaru visin raṭavāsīn visin sādā ganitot naḍu anaḍu varada nivarada vicārā avanaḍudēval haravā naḍu magaṭa ätide karaṅḍa avasara deṅḍat nivaradi kārayin härа varada kārayinnē varadavū lesaṭa nisi daṅḍa nigrahādiyak karavanu pinisa esēvī namut balavat varadakala miṇihek maraṇaviṭa raṭavāsīngenda adikaraṇa viniscayaṭa pradānavū radalavarunnenda ede vicārā nävata purātäna naḍu anaḍu liyavī tibena potvala balā marana varada nam ehäṭi avasara denavāya. Mē niyama sirit häṭiya. Varadak nätuva anunge vastuva hānikaraṅḍa rajjuruvaṅgē tanikämättaṭat amāptyayin samagavat puḷuvan häṭiyak rājadharmmayehi penī näta.

Amāptya maṅḍalayā samaga sākaccā nokora hevākamak paṭan gaṅḍavat pämini hēkamak sādāsanvaṅḍavat puḷuvanda yana vacanayaṭa?

Rajjuruvo divārātri dekhi saturubaya ätäyi yana sitiṁ ätun asun ratha pābala sēnāva āyudhādiya räskaravāgena nuvara prakāra gōpura aṭṭāla vīthi märggādi samurdha karavā gana koyivēle hēvākamak päminedo kiyā pasuvīma rajuṅgē niyama svabhāvayaka. Ebävin saturo koyi viṭakavat pämununo nam amāptya maṅḍalayā samaga sākaccā kirīmaṭa kalnoyana heyin erajjuruvaṅgē kämättaṭa caturaṅginī sēnāva vahā sannaddha karavāgana gos esaturan mäṅḍa pavatvannēyä. Tavada saturan vahā nuvaraṭa pämununo nam caturaṅginī sēnāva sannaddha karavāgaṅḍa nohäkivīnam amāptyavarungen novicārāma rājabhāṅḍāravala tibena anargga vastu rajjuruvangē kämättaṭa ehi päminṇi saturaṅḍa demin ohun hā samaga sāmadāna vīmakut äta. Amutu raṭak toṭak allanakala amāpta maṅḍalayā samaga sākaccā koṭa kerīma rajjuruvangē niyamavū siritaka. Esē kalāvū hēvākam unvahansegē tani kämättaṭa sāmadāna karaṅḍa nupuḷuvana. . . . . .

Amāptya maṅḍalayā saha väsiyannē dänumatva rajjuruvan vahansēgē kämättaṭa kenek rajakamaṭa pamunuvaṅḍa puḷuvanda yana vagaṭa?

Rajjuruvan vahansēgē raṭa uruma veṅḍa nisi nä kenek ätnam ikman prasthāvakadī pradānīm hā samaga ekinayan ayaṭa rājjaya bāra karaṇavā misa unvahansēge tani kämättaṭa nupuḷuvana. Ikmanak näti kālayehidī rājjaya denavā nam amāptya maṅḍalayā ätuluvū raṭavāsīn samagama pera sirit cāritra saha rāja perahära karavā rājjaya bhāra kirīma niyamayaka.

Raṭa āṅḍu kirīmaṭa palamuven dīlā tibena anājñāvalin rajjuruvan vahansēlā häsireṅḍa ōnä anājñāvaḷut ätuvāda e anājñāval koyivāda e anā(jñā)val dunnē kavda e de liyavī tibenavāda livun tibennē kotanada yana mē vagaṭa?

Rajjuruvan vahansēlā häsireṅḍa ōnä anājñāval dasayak äta. E koyi koyivāda yatahot dandīmaya, silräkīmaya, tägi dīmaya, pṛjubhavaya, mädahatbavaya, tapasäti bavaya, kroda nokirīmaya, hinṣā nokirīmaya, kṣamāvīmaya, aviruddha bavaya yana mē dasaya. Dandīma nam śramana Brāhmaṇādī yācakayiṅḍa batpilī ādiya dīmaya. Silräkīma nam nokaṅḍa koṭa āgama därärimaya. Tyāgībava nam ket vat ādī utunvastu dīmaya. Pṛjubava nam sita vanka cāṭu näti bavaya, mädahatbava nam siyallanṭa eka śäṭi bavaya, tapas ätibava nam rūpaya, śabdaya, gandhaya, rasayạ, ispharṣaya yana mekī äḷum pasehi pävati triṣṇāvaya mäṅḍa pävätvīmaya. Kroda nokirīma nam vayira näti näti bavaya. Hinṣā nokirīma nam niraparādha ayaṭa vada noyedīmaya. Kṣamāvīma nam novicārā varadaṭa nokipīmaya. Aviruddhabava nam siyaḷu ayaṭa viruddha näti bavaya yana me anājñā dasaya daṁbadiva Visālā mahanuvara Sāranda nanvū maha vihārayehidī apa Budu rajānan vahansē visin mema nuvara Liccavi rajjuruvan

vahansēlāṭa desanā kara vadāla bava Diksaňgiya yana potē liyavī tibenavāya. . . . . .

Raṭa āňḍu kirīmaṭa palamuven pangāḍan kara tibena anājñāvak ädda yana mē vagaṭa?

Purātäna paṭan niyamava tibena anājñāval äta. Eyin palamuveni anājñāva nam Buddhāgama ära veṇim āgamak nogannā anājñāvaya. Mavubisavun vahansē nomaraṇa deveni anājñāvaya. Piyarajjuruvan vahansē nomaraṇa tunveni anājñāvaya. Yahapat saṁghayā vahansēla nomaraṇa sataraveṇi anājñāvaya. Budun dhātuya pilima pavatnā vehera vihāra bodhivrakṣa siňda biňda nodamana pasveni anājñāvaya. Prānaghāta nokaraṇa saveni anājñāvaya. Sorakan nokaraṇa satveni anājñāvaya. Paradāra nokaraṇa aṭaveni anājñāvaya. Boru nokiyana navaveni anājñāvaya. Surapāna nokaraṇa dasaveni anājñāvaya. Mesē anājñāval dasayak raṭa āňḍukirīmaṭa palamuven valaňgu karaṇa lesa pangāḍan kara tibenavāya.

Rajjuruvan vahansē e anājñāval pähära härа yaṁ asādhāraṇa napuru kriyāvak karatot e adikaraṇa amāptavaru visin tahanan kara siṭuvaňḍa puḷuvanda yana mē vagaṭa?

Yan rajjuruvan vahansē kenek mehi kī dasavidha anājñāval varadavā napuru adharmiṣṭa kriyāval karatot amāpta maňḍalayā visin ē de athiṭuvaňḍa bale äta. Ē kesēḍa? Yaṭagiya davasa Daṁbadiva ek nuvareka pōrisāda ṇam rajek rahasin miṇusun marā mas anubhaṽa karaṇa bava dänagat amāptya varuda raṭaväsiyoda ekatuva rajjuruvaňḍa minīmas nokaṇa häṭiyaṭa noyek prakārayen kiyā hiṭalat eraja eveni kriyāven valakā gata nohī ē raja nuvarin elavā venin raja kumaruvek rājjasrīyaṭa pamunuvā gat vaga Sutasoma Jātakaya yaṇa pote penī äta.

Rajjuruvan vahansē visin ē adikaraṇa amāptya maṅḍalayā ahakkara vena aya ehi tabanḍa puḷuvanva ädda yana mē äsīmaṭa?

Yam rāja aparādādhi väräddak kala amāpta kenek ätnam ē väräddа harihäṭi oppuveṅḍa yedunu kaḍinaminma ohu ahakkara vena kenek ē tanaturaṭa patkaraṅḍa puḷuvanvā misa amāpta maṅḍala ekaviṭa ahakkaraṅḍa nupuḷuvana.

Palamu kī viniscayen kammutuvū deyak rajjuruvan vahansē emalesa karaṅḍa ōnäda, ehäṭi nova pähära hariṅḍa puḷuvanda yana mē äsīmaṭa?

Viniscayen kammutu unu deval pähära hariṅḍa maha rajjuruvanvahansēṭa bale äta. Ehenumut utun āgama vardhana kirīma saha raṭa āṅḍu kirīma pinisa potvala liyavī tibena rāja dharmmaval vena amāptyavaru sämadena ekatuva kiyā hiṭiyot ē de akaṅḍa nokora pavatiṅḍa ōnävat äta. . . . . .

Raṭa āṅḍu kirīme kāraṇāval gäna saṁghaya vahansēlā visin karaṇa kiyana dēvaḷut ätuvāda yana mē äsīmaṭa?

Mema nuvara purātäna paṭan pävati tibeṇa mahavihāra dekē saṁghayā ätuluva me Lakdiva vasana säma saṁghayā vahansēlāṭada nāyaka tānāntiriyaṭa päminiṇa hiṭina denamada mekī śāma denāṭama mulādäni saṁgharājayānan vahansēda venat dänīmehi dakṣa darmma kathikayan vahansēlāda 'Maharaja dasarāja dharmmayaṭa novenasva rājjaya kala mänaväyi' kiyā avavāda anuśāsanā karaṇavāya. . . . . .

TRANSLATION

Is there any customary law handed down from ancient times before the existence of a king at Kanda Uḍa Nuvara? By whom and under what circumstances was such law instituted? Has such law been committed to writing?

If it is asked in what circumstances did a king first appear in this Island of Srī Laṁkā, two thousand three hundred and twelve years ago on Tuesday the Full Moon day of the month Vesak, Prince Vijaya, the eldest of the sons of King Siṁhabāhu, who reigned in the city Siṁha Pura in the country of Lāla in Daṁbadiva, came by ship with seven hundred warlike adherents and landed in Laṁkā and became king.

Who first gave order for the establishment of a king in Laṁkā?

Our Lord Buddha who attained supreme Buddhahood after fulfilling the thirty Sublime Perfections.

On what occasion was this order given?

On the Full Moon day of the month Duruta, nine months after he had attained Buddhahood, our Lord travelled through the air from the mid region of Daṁbadiva, and rested above over where the great assembly of Yakṣas had met in the middle of Laṁkā at the beautiful garden of Mahānāṁga. There after striking terror

into their hearts by the display of rain and storm and darkness, he summoned by his power the land of Giri, placed the yakṣas therein and sent it back. As at the time Laṅkā was void of human inhabitants, he preached to the large gathering of devas(deities)who assembled there, and established them in the Refuge and Ethical laws and after extending his protection over this Island that it should thereafter become the abode of men, returned to Daṁbadiva.

And so it came to pass that when after forty-five years as Buddha, our Lord on the day of his passing away, as he lay on his bed in the pleasure garden of the Mallava Rājās in Kusinārā Nuvara in Daṁbadiva, from among the gods of ten thousand worlds who thronged around he addressed the God Śakra(Devendra), who stood near. 'My Sāsana, O God Śakra, will hereafter be established in the island of Laṅkā. And this day Prince Vijaya, the eldest son of King Siṁhabāhu of Siṁhapura in Lāla of Daṁbadiva is landing with seven hundred followers, his courtiers, in the Island and assuming the kingship. Therefore do thou protect this Raja and his followers and Laṅkā.' Such was the command he gave. Thus bidden the God Śakra summoned the God Viṣṇu and said 'Lotus hued One, zealously guard Prince Vijaya and his followers and the Sāsana of Buddha which is to endure in Laṅkā for five thousand years to come.' And the God Viṣṇu thereupon went down to Laṅkā and took it under his protection.

Following on the command of Buddha, King Vijaya of the Sūriya Vaṁsa reigned at Tāmrapanni Nuvara in Laṅkā for thirty-eight years being the first to rule as king. Further be it known that commencing from the first

King Vijaya and ending with the present King Kīrti Srī Rājasiṁha, in this the Buddhist year 2312, the number of kings who have reigned in Laṅkā during this period, is one hundred and sixty-nine.

On the demise of a king, what is the procedure followed for securing another king for the kingdom?

If there is a prince the king may before his death, along with the Council of Ministers, entrust the kingdom to him. If he dies without this being done, inquiry is made by the Council of Ministers to ascertain if there is a member of the rāja vaṁsa(royal descent) in Laṅkā and he is entrusted with the sovereignty. Failing that it is the custom at Maha Nuvara from ancient times to send presents to Madhurāpura and other countries where the religion of Buddha and the Sūriya Vaṁsa are found and fetch royal princes and princesses and keep them for the sovereignty. If that again is not possible a member of the Bandāravaliya is selected.

Where a king has several princes, is there any rule permitting the passing over of the eldest and the selection of a younger prince?

Among princes seniority of birth does not give a right to kingship. What does give a right is the possession of virtue, wisdom and merit. Out of the ten sons of King Muṭasīva who reigned at Anurādhapura in Laṅkā, the second was distinguished for these qualities, and was elevated to the kingship despite the fact that he had an elder brother. This fact will be found stated in the book named Rājaratnākaraya. Whether the royal father is alive or not, this is the custom to be followed; nevertheless it is competent for him to entrust the

kingship to any prince he prefers.

Does the king possess the power of acting according to his own free-will, in matters relating to the government of the country?

If the king has knowledge of traditional law, that is, of custom as to what is just and what unjust, as handed down from ancient times, as well as of the Sacred Law-what accords with religion and what does not; there are matters of administration which one of such great wisdom and learning can decide according to his sole judgement, but there are, likewise, many other matters which have to be done after careful inquiry from the Council of Ministers and the people. If the question is in doubt, what the great king Parākramabāhu who reigned at Polonnaruva in this Laṅkā did according to his sole judgment, and what after consultation with the Council of Ministers, is narrated in the Mahāvaṁsa.

Among the rules for the government of the kingdom, are there any by which the king should regulate his own conduct?

'The foundation of kingly power is the conquest of the senses,' say the opening words of the Nīti Śāstra. The five senses are the eyes, ear, nose, tongue and body. Their conquest consists in the absence of covetousness at the sight of the wife or other possession of another, the ignoring of lying or malicious tales that are heard, indifference to the attractions of what smell or taste sweet, and to the allurements of bodily pleasures.

The conquest over the senses arises from reverence towards one's parents, teachers and elders, which

reverence is begotten of association with men of wisdom; this again is the fruit of learning, for learning makes one complete; and devotion to learning leads to the control of desire; all that is desired can be achieved by him who has learned to control the mind. Such are the rules that should regulate the conduct of kings; evidence on the subject will be found in the Telpātrā Jātakaya.

Can the king of his sole opinion condemn a person to death or confiscate his property without making full inquiry from another or without charging him with a definite offence?

If in the present, past, or future, in any territory, country or city the ministers and inhabitants have appointed or will appoint a king, it is for the purpose of ensuring inquiry and decision between the just and the unjust, the right and the wrong; of seeing that injustice is suppressed and justice upheld, of protecting the innocent and punishing the guilty by suitable punishment. Nevertheless when a person accused of grave crime is condemned to death, the matter should be discussed with the inhabitants and the principal nobles (Radalavaru) who constitute the High Court of Justice, the books where the ancient precedents of such cases are recorded should be consulted, and if the crime is punishable with death, order should be made accordingly. Such is the recognised custom. But where a man has not been found guilty the power to confiscate his property whether of his sole judgment or in consultation with his ministers is not contemplated anywhere in the Rāja Dharma.

Can the king either wage war or end one without first consulting the Council of Ministers?

With the thought that day and night there is fear of enemies, it is the recognised duty of a king to have in readiness tusked elephants, horses, chariots, foot soldiers and weapons, and in the city to maintain the ramparts, gates, watch posts, streets, approaches and suchlike and to be ever on the alert for the outbreak of hostilities. Therefore if at any time enemies should appear, as there would be no time for deliberation with the ministers, he should on his own initiative call out his army in its four branches and go forth and crush the enemy. Further should enemies swiftly approach the city itself, and it be impossible to arm his forces, he may of his own initiative and without consulting the ministers, deliver the treasures in the Royal Treasury to the approaching enemy and make peace with them. It is a well recognised custom for the king to consult the ministers before invading another country; he may not terminate a war so begun according to his sole judgment.

Can the king according to his own wish and without the knowledge of the ministers and inhabitants, appoint another to the kingship?

In a case of emergency, any relation of the king, who is justly entitled to succeed to the throne, may be nominated to the sovereignty, with the consent of the chiefs, but no such power is vested in the king alone. But if the kingdom is handed over at a time when there is no such urgency, this should be done along with the ministers and inhabitants according to ancient custom and with royal ceremonial.

Among the laws laid down at the beginning for the government of the kingdom, are there any to which the kings themselves must conform? If so what are they, by whom were they laid down, have they been committed to writing, and where are such writings to be found?

There are ten laws to which kings must conform; they are the laws of charity, piety, liberality, uprightness, impartiality, self-control. forgiveness, gentleness, patience and humanity.

Charity,	viz.,	giving food and clothing to Buddhist monks, Brahmins and others who live on alms
Piety,	viz.,	constantly maintaining the Buddhist precepts
Liberality,	viz.,	granting fields, gardens and similar valuable gifts
Uprightness,	viz.,	being void of deceit and cunning
Impartiality,	viz.,	dealing with all men alike
Self-control,	viz.,	avoiding the excesses that attend the senses of sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch
Forgiveness,	viz.,	not nourishing feelings of anger
Gentleness,	viz.,	not punishing, tormenting or molesting the innocent
Patience,	viz.,	abstaining from condemnation without inquiry
Humanity,	viz.,	absence of enmity towards all beings

It is stated in the book named Dik Saňgiya that these ten laws were laid down by the Buddha at Sarandada Mahā Vihāra in the city of Visālā Maha Nuvara in Daňbadiva when preaching to the Licchavi Rājas of the place.

Is there any system of laws established from of old for the government of the kingdom?

Laws ordained from ancient times exist. Of these the first lays down that no religion is to be accepted by the king save that of Buddha.

The second, that the king shall not put to death the Queen Mother.

The third, that the king shall not put to death the Royal Father.

The fourth, that the king shall not put to death any pious members of the Saṅgha.

The fifth, that he shall not destroy stūpas, temples containing the relics or images of Buddha or injure any sacred Bo-trees.

The sixth, that he shall not deprive any beings of life.

The seventh, that he shall not commit theft.

The eighth, that he shall not commit adultery.

The ninth, that he shall not utter a falsehood.

The tenth, that he shall not take intoxicating drinks.

These ten have been established from of old as fundamental for the government of the country.

If the king in contempt of these laws indulge in any unjust cruelty, is it competent for the ministers responsible for justice, to forbid the same and put a stop to it?

If a king violates these ten laws and indulges in acts of cruelty and unrighteousness, the Council of Ministers is empowered to put a stop to that. For instance once upon a time in a certain city of Daṁbadiva a king named Porisāda was in the habit of having people killed secretly in order to eat their flesh; learning of this the ministers and inhabitants earnestly besought him not to eat human flesh but were unable to restrain him from the act. Thereupon they expelled him from the city and appointed another royal prince to the kingship. This is so related in the Sutasoma Jātaka.

Can a king dismiss his Council of Ministers and appoint others in their place?

If an individual minister has committed an act of treason, immediately on such a charge being proved in due form, he can be dismissed and another appointed to his office; but the king cannot dismiss the Council of Ministers as a body.

Is the king bound to accept a matter finally determined by the Court of Justice or can he avoid doing so?

The king has the power to avoid matters finally determined by the Court of Justice; nevertheless if all the other ministers make a representation that the Rāja Dharma for the support of religion and the government of the country as stated in the books is different, he must not override but uphold their decision.

Are there matters regarding the administration of the country in which the Saṅgha may participate?

The two Bhikkhus who are appointed as Nāyaka of the Saṅgha(chief of the Saṅgha)not only of the two Mahā Vihāras which have existed at Maha Nuvara from ancient times, but of the entire body residing in this island of Laṅkā, and the Saṅgha Rāja who is the chief of all of them, and others skilled in the knowledge of the religion and eloquent in its exposition, can give counsel and say, 'Oh King, mayest thou be pleased to govern the kingdom without varying from the Dasa Rāja Dharma.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Sources: Literary

Pāli

Aṅguttara Nikāya - Edited by R. Morris and E. Hardy. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1885-1900.

_____ - (The Book of the Gradual Sayings). Vols. 1, 2 and 5. Translated by F. L. Woodward. Vols. 3 and 4. Translated by E. M. Har. London: The Pali Text Society, 1932-1936.

Atthasālinī - Edited by E. Müller. London: The Pali Text Society, 1897.

Cūḷavaṁsa - Edited by W. Geiger. 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1925.

_____ - Translated by W. Geiger. Colombo, 1953; reprint edition, London: The Pali Text Society, 1973.

_____ - Edited and translated into Sinhalese by Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala and Batuwantudava. Fourth edition. Colombo: The Govt. Printer, 1917.

Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā - Edited by H. C. Norman. 4 Vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1906-1914.

Dhātuvaṁsa - Edited by Gintota Dhammakkhanda. Dodanduwa (Ceylon): Vidyaprakasa Press.

Dīgha Nikāya - Edited by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. E. Carpenter. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1890-1911.

_____ - (The Dialogues of the Buddha). Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids. London: The Pali Text Society, 1899-1921.

Dīpavaṁsa - Edited and translated by Hermann Oldenberg. London, 1879.

Hatthavanagallavihāravaṁsa - Edited by C. E. Godakumbura. London: The Pali Text Society, 1956.

Mahābodhivaṁsa - Edited by Arthur Strong. London: The Pali Text Society, 1891.

Mahāvaṁsa - Edited by W. Geiger. London: The Pali Text Society, 1908.

_____ - Translated by W. Geiger. London: The Pali Text Society, 1912; reprint edition, London: The Pali Text Society, 1960.

_____ - Edited and translated into Sinhalese by Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala and Batuwantudava. Colombo, 1875.

Majjhima Nikāya - Edited by V. Trenckner and R. Chalmers. London: The Pali Text Society, 1888-1927.

_____ - (Further Dialogues of the Buddha). Translated by Lord Chalmers. 4 vols. London, 1926-1927.

Manorathapūraṇī - Edited by Max Wellesen and Herman Kopp. 4 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1930-1940.

Papañcasūdanī - Edited by J. H. Woods, D. Kosambi and I. B. Horner. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1922-1938.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Cariyā Piṭaka Commentary). Edited by D. L. Baruva. London: The Pali Text Society, 1939.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Itivuttaka Commentary). Edited by M. M. Bose. 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1934-1936.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Petavatthu Commentary). Edited by E. Hardy. London: The Pali Text Society, 1894.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Theragāthā Commentary). Edited by F. L. Woodward. 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1940-1952.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Therigāthā Commentary). Edited by E. Müller. London: The Pali Text Society, 1893.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Udāna Commentary). Edited by F. L. Woodward. London: The Pali Text Society, 1926.

Paramatthadīpanī - (Vimānavatthu Commentary). Edited by E. Hardy. London: The Pali Text Society, 1901.

Paramatthajotikā - (Khuddaka Pāṭha Commentary). Edited by Helmer Smith. London: The Pali Text Society, 1915.

Paramatthajotikā - (Sutta Nipāta Commentary). Edited by Helmer Smith. London: The Pali Text Society, 1916.

Rasavāhinī - Edited by Kirialle Ñānavimala. Colombo, 1961.

Saddhammappakāsinī - Edited by C. V. Joshi. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1933-1947.

Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa - Edited by A. P. Buddhadatta. Colombo, 1959.

Samantapāsādikā - Edited by Takakusu and M. Nagai 7 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1924-1947.

Sammohavinodanī - Edited by A. P. Buddhadatta. London: The Pali Text Society, 1923.

Saṁyutta Nikāya - Edited by L. Freer. London: The Pali Text Society, 1884-1898.

_____ - (Book of the Kindred Sayings). Vols. 1-3. Translated by C. A. F. Rhys Davids. Vols. 4-5. Translated by F. L. Woodward. London: The Pali Text Society, 1917-1930.

Sāratthappakāsinī - Edited by F. L. Woodward. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1929-1937.

Sīhaḷavatthuppakaraṇa - Edited by A. P. Buddhadatta. Colombo, 1959.

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī - Edited by W. Stede. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1930-1932.

The Jātakas - Edited by V. Fausböll. 7 vols. London, 1877-1897.

The Jātakas - Edited by E. B. Cowell and translated by various hands. Cambridge, 1895-1913.

Thūpavaṁsa - Edited by B. C. Law. London: The Pali Text Society, 1935.

Vaṁsatthappakāsinī - Edited by G. P. Malalasekera. 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1935.

Vinaya Piṭaka - Edited by H. Oldenberg. 5 vols. London, 1879-1883. Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids and H. Oldenberg. 4 vols. Oxford, 1881-1885.

Visuddhimagga - Edited by C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London: The Pali Text Society, 1920-1921. Translated by Pe Maung Tin. 3 vols. 1923-1931.

Sanskrit

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa - Edited, translated and explained by M. Haug. 2 vols. Bombay, 1863.

Arthaśāstra - Edited by R. Shamasastry. Mysore, 1924. Translated by R. Shamasastry. 8th edition. Mysore, 1967.

Atharvavēda - Edited by Pandit Pandurang Shankar. 4 vols. Bombay, 1895-1898. Translated by M. Bloomfield. S.B.E. Vol. XLII

Mahābhārata - (Critical Edition). Edited by various hands. 16 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1927-1954.

Mahābhārata - (Rājadharmānuśāsana Parva of the Śanti Parva). Edited and translated by P. C. Roy. Calcutta, 1889.

Mānava Dharma Śāstra - Edited by V. N. Mandalika. 2 vols. Bombay, 1886. Translated by G. Bühler. S.B.E., vol. XXV. Oxford, 1886.

Mudrārākṣasa - Edited by C. R. Devadhar and V. M. Bedekar. Bombay: Keshav Bhikaji Dhawale, 1948.

Rāmāyaṇa - Edited by W. Carey and J. Marshman. 3 vols. Serampore, 1806. Translated by M. N. Dutt. 7 vols. Calcutta, 1891-1894.

Ṛgvēda - (The hymns of Ṛgveda). Edited by F. Max Müller. 2 vols. London, 1877.

_____ - Translated with popular commentary by Ralph T. H. Griffith. 2 vols. Banaras, 1896-1897.

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa - Edited by A. Weber. London, 1885.

_____ - Translated by J. Eggeling. S.B.E. Vols. XII, XXVI, XLI, XLIII and XLIV. Oxford, 1882-1900.

Suvarṇaprabhāṣa Sūtra - Edited by Bunyo Nanjio and H. Izdumi. Kyoto, 1930.

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa - Edited by R. Mitra. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1859.

Sinhalese

Butsaraṇa - Edited by W. Sorata. Colombo: K. D. P. Amarasekera, 1931.

Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya - Edited by M. Vimalakirtti and N. Sominda. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co, 1960.

Eḷu-attanagaluvaṁsaya - Edited by Simon de Silva. Colombo, 1944.

Kāvyaśekharaya - Edited by Ratmalane Dharmarama. Kelaniya, 1935.

Lak Raja Lō Sirita - Palm-leaf Manuscript. British Museum, OR 6603 (65) 665.

Nikāya Saṅgrahaya - Edited by W. F. Gunawardhana, translated by C. M. Fernando. Colombo: The Govt. Printer, 1908.

Nīti Nighaṇḍuva - Edited and translated by C. J. R. Le Mesurier and T. B. Panabokke. Colombo: The Govt. Printer, 1880.

Pūjāvaliya - (The 34th chapter of the Pūjāvaliya). Edited by Mabopitiye Medhankara. Colombo, 1932.

_____ - (A contribution to the history of Ceylon). Translated by B. Gunasekara. Colombo, 1911.

Rājāvaliya - Edited by B. Gunasekara. Colombo, 1911.

_____ - Translated by B. Gunasekara. Colombo, 1900; reprint edition, Colombo, 1954.

Saddharmālaṁkāraya - Edited by B. Saddhatissa. Colombo: Panadura Press, B.E. 2478

Saddharmaratanāvaliya - Edited by D. B. Jayatilake. Colombo: Laṅkābhinava Viśruta Press, 1936.

Sigiri Graffiti - Edited by S. Paranavitana. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Sikavalaṅdavinisa - Edited by D. B. Jayatilake. Colombo: Laṅkābhinava Viśruta Press, 1934.

Siyabaslakara - Edited by Henpitagedara Ñānatilaka and Ñānasīha. Colombo, 1933.

Siṁhala Bōdhi Vaṁsaya - Edited by K. Paññāsekhara. Colombo: Vidyārthaprakāśa Press, 1928.

Vesaturudāsanne - Edited by D. E. Hettiaratchi. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1950.

Original Sources: Epigraphic and Archaeological

Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon - Colombo, 1879 (in progress).

Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy - Madras, 1887 (in progress).

Archaeological Survey of India - (Annual Reports). Calcutta, 1903 (in progress).

Bell, H. C. P. - 'Anurādhapura - identification of ruins'. Ceylon Literary Register, vol. 5, no. 47, 1891.

_____ - Seventh Progress Report, Anurādhapura and North Central Province. Ceylon Sessional Papers, Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. Colombo, 1896.

_____ - Report on the Kĕgalla District of the province of Sabaragamuwa, Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. 1904.

_____ - 'Inscriptions at Sīgiriya'. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Reports, 1911-1912, appendix D, pp. 106-109.

_____ - 'Diṁbulāgala its caves, ruins and inscriptions'. The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. III, part I, 1917, pp. 1-12.

_____ - 'Diṁbulāgala its caves, ruins and inscriptions'. The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. III, part II, 1917, pp. 69-79.

_____ - 'Archaeological research in the Egoḍa Pattuwa and Tamankaḍuwa'. The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. III, part III, 1918, pp. 193-215.

Blakesley, T. H. - 'On the ruins of Sīgiri in Ceylon'. J.R.A.S., new series, 1876, pp. 53-61.

Burrows, S. M. - Buried cities of Ceylon. Third edition. Colombo, 1899.

Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum - Vol. III, Inscriptions of the early Gupta kings and their successors. Edited by J. F. Fleet. Calcutta, 1888.

_____ - Vol. I, Inscriptions of Asoka. Edited by E. Hultzsch. Oxford, 1925.

Epigraphia Zeylanica - Vols. I-II. Edited by D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe. Colombo: Archaeological Department of Ceylon, 1904-1927.

_____ - Vols. III-V. Edited by S. Paranavitana and C. E. Godakumbura. Colombo: Archaeological Department of Ceylon, 1928-1965.

Müller, E. - 'Text and translation of the inscription of Mahinda III at Mihintale'. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. VI, no. 21, 1880, pp. 5-36.

_____ - Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon. London, 1883.

Nicholas, C. W. - 'Texts of the Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Ruhuna National Park'. J.R. A.S.C.B., vol. II (new series), part II, 1952, pp. 126-140.

_____ - 'Texts of the cave inscriptions at Hiňdagala vihāra'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. II, nos. 3 and 4, 1953, pp. 221-224.

Paranavitana, S. - 'The excavations in the citadel at Anurādhapura'. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. III, no. 83, 1930, pp. 471-485.

_____ - 'The Hiňdagala Rock Inscription'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XVI, nos. 1 and 2, 1958, pp. 1-5.

Paranavitana, S. - 'Rock inscriptions at Timbiriväva and Andaragollāva in the Vilpattu sanctuary'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XIX, no. 2, 1961, pp. 95-104.

_____ - 'Some Sinhalese inscriptions of circa sixth century'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XX, no. 1, 1962, pp. 1-11.

_____ - Inscriptions of Ceylon, vol. I. Colombo: Archaeology Department of Ceylon, 1970.

South Indian Inscriptions - Madras, 1890 (in progress).

Secondary Sources

Abayasekera, E. A. - 'Advice to a king' (A translation of certain stanzas of Kāvyaśekharaya). Ceylon Literary Register, vol. IV, pp. 14-18.

Adikaram, E. W. - Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon. Colombo, 1946; Third impression, Colombo: D.S. Puswella, 1953.

Aiyangar, S. K. - Some contributions of South India to Indian Culture. Calcutta, 1923.

Altekar, A. S. - State and Government in Ancient India from earliest times to 1200 A.D. Banaras: Motilal Banarsidass, 1949.

Anjaria, H. G. - Nature and Grounds of Political Obligations in the Hindu State. London, 1935.

Ariyapala, M. B. - Society in Medieval Ceylon. Kandy: K. V. G. de Silva, 1956.

_____ - 'Succession to the throne in ancient Ceylon'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XII, no. 4, 1954, pp. 195-216.

Banerji, N. C. - Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories. 2 vols. Calcutta: R. Cambray & Co. and C. O. Book Agency, 1927-1938.

Basham, A. L. - 'Prince Vijaya and the Aryanization of Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 3, 1952, pp. 163-171.

_____ - The wonder that was India. London: Fontana, 1954.

Beal, S. - Si Yu Ki. Buddhist records of the Western world (translated from Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang, A.D.629). 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1906.

_____ - Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims, travels of Fah-Hian and Sung-Yun, Buddhist pilgrims from China to India, 400 A.D. and 518 A.D. (translated from Chinese). London: Trubner & Co., 1869.

Bechert, H. - 'Mother right and succession to the throne in Malabar and Ceylon'. The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies, vol. VI, no. 1, 1963, pp. 25-39.

Bertolacci, A. - A View of the Commercial, Agricultural and Financial Interests of Ceylon. Appendix A. London: Black, Pabury and Allen 1817.

Bhandarkar, D. R. - Lectures on the Ancient History of India on the period from 650 to 325 B.C. - The Carmichael Lectures 1918 - University of Calcutta.

_____ - Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity. Banaras, 1929.

Buddhadatta, A. P. - 'Some corrections of Geiger's Mahāvaṁsa translation'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. VII, no. 2, 1949, pp. 106-118; no. 3, 1949, pp. 185-197.

_____ - 'Some corrections of Geiger's Cūḷavaṁsa translation'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. VIII, no. 2, 1950, pp. 96-109; vol. VIII, no. 3, 1950, pp. 161-180.

Chelvathurai, R. - 'Theory and practice of politics in mediaeval Ceylon'. Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore, vol. 29, no. 1, July 1938, pp. 1-37.

Clarke, Arthur C. - 'Sīgiri: fortress in the sky' Times of Ceylon Annual, Colombo, 1962.

Codrington, H. W. - Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon. Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938.

_____ - A Short History of Ceylon. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1926; revised edition, 1947.

Cœdès, G. - 'La destination funéraire des grands monuments khmèrs'. Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, XL, 1940, pp. 315-349.

Coedès, G - The Making of South East Asia. Translated by H. M. Wright. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

_____ - Angkor: An Introduction. Translated and edited by Emily Floyd Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press, 1963; fourth impression, 1969.

Dahanaika, D. - A brief account of the rites, ceremonies and festivals in connection with the inauguration and coronation of the ancient kings and queens of Lanka. Galle, 1902.

Davy, John. - An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1821.

de Casparis, J. G. - 'New evidence on cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times'. Artibus Asiae, vol. 24, nos. 3-4, pp. 241-248. Switzerland: Ascona, 1961.

Deraniyagala, P. E. P. - 'Some sidelights on the Sinhala monastery fortress of Sihagiri'. Spolia Zeylanica, Bulletin of the National Museums of Ceylon, Colombo, pt. 1, Feb. 1951, pp. 69-75; pt. 2, Dec. 1951, pp. 177-178.

Derrett, J., Duncan, M. - 'Bhū-bharaṇa, bhū-pālana, bhū-bhojana and Indian conundrum'. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, vol. XXII, 1959, pp. 108-123.

Desai, H. M. - 'Indo-Ceylonese cultural and economic link'. In Encyclopaedia of South India and Ceylon. Edited by N. Madhava Rao, 1937-1938, pp. 24-30.

De Silva, C. M. Austin. - 'Sovereign queens of Lanka'. Ceylon Fortnightly Review, vol. 6, no. 23, 1954; vol. 6, no. 24, 1954.

_____ - 'The Satara Varan Devas, or the four guardian gods in Buddhism'. Spolia Zeylanica: Bulletin of the National museums of Ceylon, Colombo, vol. 30, no. 1, 1963, pp. 165-172.

Dewaraja, L. S. - The Kandyan Kingdom of Ceylon (1707-1760). Colombo: Lake House Investments Ltd., 1972.

Dikshitar, V. R. R. - 'South India and Ceylon'. Journal of the Indian Research Institute, Calcutta, vol. 15 (B. H. Baruva Commemoration Volume), 1948-1949, pp. 91-106.

Drekmeier, C. - Kingship and Community in Early India. California: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Dumont, Louis. - 'The conception of kingship in Ancient India'. In Contributions to Indian Sociology. Edited by Louis Dumont and D. Pocock, no. VI, Dec. 1962, pp. 48-77.

Ekanayake, A. E. de S. - 'On the form of Government under the Native Sovereigns of Ceylon'. J.R.A.S., new series, vol. VIII, pp. 297-304.

Eliot, Charles. - Hinduism and Buddhism: An Historical Sketch. 3 vols. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1921.

Ellawala, H. - Social History of Early Ceylon. Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs, 1969.

Fernando, C. M. - 'The inauguration of the king in ancient Ceylon'. J.R.A.S. C.B., vol. XIV, no. 47, 1896, pp. 125-130.

_____ - 'The laws and constitution of the Sinhalese kingdom'. Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. III, no. 3, 1916, pp. 167-173.

Figgis, J. N. - The Theory of the Divine Rights of Kings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.

Frankfort, H. - Kingship and the Gods. Chicago, 1948.

Frazer, J. G. - The Golden bough: A study in magic and religion. Abridged edition. London: Macmillan, 1925.

Gadd, C. J. - Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Geiger, Wilhelm. - The Dīpavaṁsa and Mahāvaṁsa and their historical development in Ceylon. Translated into English by Ethel M. Coomaraswamy. Colombo, 1908.

_____ - 'The trustworthiness of the Mahāvaṁsa'. Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. VI, no. 2, 1930, pp. 205-228.

Geiger, Wilhelm. - 'New contributions to the interpretation of the Mahāvaṁsa'. Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. IX, no. 1 (Haraprasad Sastri Memorial Number), 1933, pp. 107-112.

_____ - 'Contributions from the Mahāvaṁsa to our knowledge of the mediaeval culture of Ceylon'. The Journal of the Greater India Society, vol. II, no. 2, July 1935, pp. 89-111; vol. III, no. 2, July 1936, pp. 139-157; vol. IV no. 2, 1937, pp. 79-96; vol. V, no. 1, 1938, pp. 1-21; vol. V, no. 2, July 1938, pp. 93-127.

_____ - Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times. Edited by Heinz Bechert. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1960.

Ghoshal, U. N. - A History of Indian Political Ideas (the ancient period and the period of transition to the middle ages). Madras: Oxford University Press, 1959; reprint edition, 1966.

Godakumbura, C. E. - 'The Cūḷavaṁsa: its authorship and date'. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXXVIII, no. 107, 1949, pp. 123-125.

_____ - 'Historical writings in Sinhalese'. In Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, pt. 1, chap. 6, pp. 72-86. Edited by C. H. Philips. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Gokhale, B. G. - 'Dhammiko Dhammarājā'. Indica, Bombay, 1953, pp. 161-165.

Gokhale, B. G. - 'Early Buddhist Kingship'. The Journal of Asian Studies, vol. XXVI, no. 1, 1966, pp. 15-22.

_____ - 'Dhamma as a political concept in early Buddhism'. Journal of Indian History, vol. XLIV, pt. II, 1968, pp. 249-261.

_____ - 'The early Buddhist view of the state'. Journal of the American Oriental Society, 89.4, 1969, pp. 731-738.

Gokhale, J. B. - 'Hindu and Buddhist Political Traditions: A comparison'. Journal of Indian History, vol. XLIX, April, Aug. and Dec. 1971, pp. 195-216.

Gonda, J. - Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Gopalan, R. - History of the Pallavas of Kanchi. Madras: University of Madras, 1928.

Gunawardana, R. A. L. H. - 'The history of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965.

Gurusinghe, A. - 'Coronation ceremonies in ancient Ceylon'. Ceylon Causerie, Colombo, vol. 8, no. 96, April 1937, pp. 27-28.

Heesterman, J. C. - The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration. S' Gravenhage: Mouton 1957.

Hettiarachchy, T. - 'History of Kingship in Ceylon up to the fourth century A.D.' Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970.
(This work has recently been published.)

Hocart, A. M. - 'The Coronation Ceremony'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. I, no. 1, 1924-1928, pp. 27-42.

_____ - 'The Four Quarters'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. I, 1924-1928, pp. 105-111.

_____ - 'The throne in Indian art'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. I, 1924-1928, pp. 117-123.

_____ - 'Duplication of office in the Indian State'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. I, 1924-1928, pp. 205-210.

_____ - Kingship. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

_____ - Kings and Councillors. Cairo, 1936.

Hopkins, E. W. - 'The social and military position of the ruling caste in ancient India as represented in the Sanskrit Epic'. Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. XIII, 1889, pp. 57-372.

_____ - 'The divinity of kings'. Journal of the American Orienta Society, vol. 1i, 1931, pp. 309-316.

Indrapala, K. - 'Hinduism in ancient Ceylon: epigraphic sources of its history'. Hindu Dharma, 1961, pp. 15-18.

Jayawardhana, L. S. - 'Ideas, beliefs, forms of the Mahāvaṁsa' (a comparison with the Cūḷavaṁsa). Buddhist, vol. 20, no. 2, 1949, pp. 21-22.

Jayawardhana, W. A. - 'Some Aspects of the History of Ceylon from Sirimeghavanna to Kitti Siri Megha (304-560 A.D.)'. M.A. thesis, University of Ceylon, 1949.

_____ - 'Notes on some foreign literary sources for the study of 4th and 5th century Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 1, 1951, pp. 34-37.

_____ - 'Some observations on the nature and contents of the 4th - 6th century inscriptions of Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 2, 1951, pp. 120-121.

_____ - 'Some aspects of kingship and the administration in 4th-6th century A.D. Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 3, 1952, pp. 205-218.

Karunaratne, W. S. - 'Mahāyānism in Ceylon during the Anurādhapura Period: Epigraphical evidence'. University of Ceylon Buddhist Annual, vol. 9, 1958-1959, pp. 17-20.

Kosambi, D. D. - An Introduction to the Study of Indian History. Bombay, 1956.

Kulasuriya, A. - Simhala Sāhityaya. Maharagama: Saman Press, 1961; second edition, 1962.

Law, B. C. - Kshatriya Clans in Buddhist India. Calcutta, 1922.

_____ - A History of Pali Literature. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, 1933.

_____ - India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism. London, 1941.

Law, B. C. - On the Chronicles of Ceylon. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1947.

Law, N. N. - Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity. Oxford: Clarenden Press 1921.

Leach, E. R. - 'Hydraulic Society in Ceylon'. Past and Present, no. 15, April 1959, pp. 2-25.

Liyanagamage, A. and Gunawardana, R. (eds.). - Anurādhapura Yugaya. Kelaniya: Vidyalankara University Press, 1961.

Mahalingam, T. V. - South Indian Polity. Madras: University of Madras, 1955.

Majumdar, R. C. - Corporate Life in Ancient India. Second revised edition. Calcutta, 1922.

_____ - The Age of Imperial Unity. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan 1951.

Malalasekera, G. P. - The Pali Literature of Ceylon. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1928.

Mendis, G. C. - 'A Historical Criticism of the Mahāvaṁsa (ch. I-XX)'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1930.

_____ - The Early History of Ceylon and Its Relations with India and Other Foreign Countries. Calcutta, 1935.

_____ - 'The Pali Chronicles of Ceylon University of Ceylon Review, vol. IV, 1946, pp. 1-24.

_____ - 'The chronology of the early Pali chronicles of Ceylon'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. V, no. 1, 1949, pp. 39-54

Mendis, G. C. - 'The Vijaya Legend'. Paranavitana Felicitation Volume. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1965, pp. 263-293.

_____ - Problems of Ceylon History. Colombo: Apothecaries Co. Ltd. 1966.

Mudiyanse, N. - 'Literary and Archaeological Monuments of the Mahāyāna in Ceylon'. Ph.D. thesis, University of Ceylon, 1964.

Nell, A. - 'A query on Fa-Hian's and Buddhaghosa's visits to Ceylon Buddhist, vol. 7, no. 5, 1936.

_____ - 'The capitals of Ceylon - ancient and modern'. Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, pt. 2, no. 30, pp. 184-190. Madras, 1936.

Nicholas, C. W. - 'The titles of the Sinhalese kings as recorded in the inscriptions of 3rd century B.C. to 3rd century A.D.'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. VII, no. 4, 1949, pp. 233-248.

_____ - 'Some offices and titles in the early Sinhalese kingdom'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. VIII, no. 2, 1950, pp. 116-128.

_____ - 'Brāhmaṇas in the early Sinhalese kingdom'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. VIII, no. 4, 1950, pp. 259-263.

_____ - 'The territorial divisions of Ceylon from early times to the 12th century'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. IX, no. 1, 1951, pp. 20-51.

Nicholas, C. W. - 'Professions and occupations in the early Sinhalese kingdom'. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. V, pt. 1, 1957, pp. 68-80.

_____ - 'Historical Topography of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon'. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. VI (Special Number), 1959.

_____ - 'A short account of the history of irrigation works up to the eleventh century'. J.R.A.S.C.B. new series, vol. VII, pt. 1, 1960, pp. 43-69.

_____ and Paranavitana, S. - A Concise History of Ceylon from the earliest times to the arrival of the Portuguese in 1505. Colombo: Ceylon University Press, 1961.

_____ - 'Additions and amendments to the historical topography of ancient and mediaeval Ceylon'. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. VII, pt. 2, 1961, pp. 225-230.

Nilakanta Sastri, K. A. - The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom. London: Luzac & Co., 1929.

_____ - Studies in Cola History and Administration. Madras: University of Madras, 1932.

_____ - The Colas. 2 vols. Madras, 1935-1937.

_____ - 'Saivism in ancient Ceylon'. Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, 1965, pp. 305-312.

_____ - A History of South India from Prehistoric Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar. 3rd edition. Madras: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Obeysekere, G. - 'The Buddhist pantheon in Ceylon and its existence'. In Anthropological Studies in Theravada Buddhism. Edited by M. Nash, Yale University Press, 1966, pp. 1-26.

Panikkar, K. M. - The Ideas of Sovereignty and State in Indian Political Thought. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1963.

Paranavitana, S. - 'Mahāyānism in Ceylon'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. II, no. 1, 1928-1933, pp. 35-71.

_____ - 'Matrilineal descent in the Sinhalese royal family'. Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. II, 1928-1933, pp. 235-240.

_____ - 'Pre-Buddhist religious beliefs in Ceylon'. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXXI, no. 82, 1929, pp. 302-328.

_____ - 'The capital of Ceylon during the ninth and tenth centuries' Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G), vol. II, no. 2, 1930, pp. 141-147.

_____ - 'Two royal titles of the early Sinhalese and the origin of kingship in ancient Ceylon'. J.R.A.S., 1936, pp. 443-462.

_____ - 'Bodhisattva Avalokiteśwara in Ceylon'. B. C. Law Commemoration Volume, part II, pp. 15-18. Edited by D. R. Bhandarkar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1946.

Paranavitana, S. – 'The subject of the Sīgiri Paintings'. India Antiqua, pp. 264-269. Leiden: Kern Institute, 1947.

_____ – 'Sīgiri: the Abode of a God-king'. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. I, 1950, pp. 129-183.

_____ – 'The God Upulvan'. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, vol. VI, pp. 19-60. Colombo, 1953.

_____ – 'A royal paradise of ancient Ceylon'. Illustrated London News, 224, April 1954, pp. 530-532.

_____ – 'Chronology of Ceylon Kings, Mahāsena to Mahinda V'. Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. V, no. 1, 1955, appendix to no. 7, pp. 86-111.

_____ – 'Some aspects of the divinity of the king in ancient India and Ceylon'. Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference, 16th Session, University of Lucknow, October 1951, vol. II (select papers), Lucknow, 1955, section 8, no. 28, pp. 217-232.

_____ – 'Glimpses of the political and social conditions of mediaeval Ceylon'. Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, pp. 69-74. Colombo, 1956.

_____ – 'Was there a Gonisa Vihara in ancient Ceylon?'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XV, nos. 3 and 4, 1957, pp. 127-133.

Paranavitana, S. - The God of Adam's Peak. Artibus Asiae, Ascona, Switzerland, 1958.

_____ - 'Some regulations concerning village irrigation works in ancient Ceylon'. Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies, vol. I, no. 1, 1958, pp. 1-9.

_____ - 'The significance of the paintings of Sīgiri'. Artibus Asiae, nos. 3 and 4 (George Coedes Felicitation Volume), pp. 382-387. Ascona, Switzerland, 1961.

_____ - 'Mahānāma, the author of Mahāvaṁsa'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. XX, no. 2, 1962, pp. 269-286.

_____ - Ceylon and Malaysia. Colombo: Lake House Investments Ltd., 1966.

_____ - 'Ritual presentations and the structure of the Sinhalese pantheon'. Anthropological Studies in Theravada Buddhism, pp. 27-50. Edited by M. Nash. Yale University Press, 1966.

_____ - Sinhalayo. Colombo: Lake House Investments Ltd., 1967.

Perera, B. J. - 'Foreign trade and commerce of ancient Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 2, 1951, pp. 109-119.

_____ - 'Foreign trade and commerce in ancient Ceylon and its trade with India'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 3, 1952, pp. 193-204.

Perera, Lakshman S. - 'Institutions of Ancient Ceylon from Inscriptions'. Ph.D. thesis, University of Ceylon, 1949.

_____ - 'The Brāhmī inscriptions as a source for the study of the early history of Ceylon'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 2, 1951, pp. 79-96.

_____ - 'The royal lineage in the prasastis of the 8th-10th century inscriptions'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. II, nos. 3-4, 1953, pp. 230-236.

_____ - 'Proprietary and tenurial rights in ancient Ceylon'. Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies, vol. II, no. 1, pp. 1-36, 1959.

_____ - 'The Pali Chronicles of Ceylon' In Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, pp. 29-43, Edited by C. H. Philips. London, 1961.

Pieris, Ralph. - Sinhalese Social Organisation. Colombo: The Ceylon University Press Board, 1956.

_____ (ed.). - Some Aspects of Traditional Sinhalese Culture. A Symposium (Ceylon University conference on Traditional Cultures). Peradeniya, 1956.

Pillay, K. K. - South India and Ceylon. Madras: Madras Publishers, 1963.

Raghavan, M. D. - India in Ceylonese History, Society and Culture. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Rahula, Walpola. - 'The Sahassavatthu aṭṭhakathā and Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. II, 1944, pp. 86-91.

_____ - History of Buddhism in Ceylon (The Anurādhapura Period - 3rd century B.C. - 10th century A.C.). Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1956.

Ranawalla, G. S. - 'A Political History of Rohaṇa from 991 - 1255 A.D.'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1966.

Ray, H. C. (ed.). - University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. I, 2 parts. Colombo: Ceylon University Press, 1959, 1960.

Rhys Davids, T. W. - 'Sīgiri, the Lion Rock near Pulastipura, Ceylon and the 39th chapter of the Mahāvaṁsa'. J.R.A.S., new series, vol. VII, 1875, pp. 191-209.

_____ - Buddhist India. London, 1903.

Senaviratna, John M. - 'Sinhalese royal obsequies'. Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. II, no. 2, 1916, pp. 120-123.

_____ - 'Royalty in ancient Ceylon'. J.R.A.S.C.B., vol. XXVI, no. 71, pt. II, 1918, pp. 109-156.

_____ - 'Coronation of Sinhalese Kings' Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. VII, no. 4, 1922, pp. 220-225.

Shamasastri, R. - Evolution of Indian Polity. Calcutta, 1920.

Sharma, R. S. - Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1959.

Sinha, H. N. - Sovereignty in Ancient Indian Polity. London: Luzac & Co., 1938.

Sinha, Ram Charitra Prasad.- Kingship in Northern India. Delhi, 1968.

Spellman, John W. - Political Theory of Ancient India (A Study of Kingship from the earliest times to circa A.D. 300). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Still, John. - Ancient Capitals of Ceylon: Historical Sketches and Guide. Colombo, 1907.

Tambiah, H. W. - 'Kingship and constitution of ancient and mediaeval Ceylon'. J.R.A.S.C.B., new series, vol. VIII, pt. 2, 1963, pp. 291-311.

Vijayatunga, J. - 'Royalty in Laṅkā's long history'. New Lanka, vol. V, no. 3, Apr. 1954, pp. 14-18.

Vogel, J. P. - Buddhist Art in India, Ceylon and Java. Translated from the Dutch by A. J. Barnouw. Oxford, 1936.

Wagle, Narendra K. - Society at the time of the Buddha. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1966.

Wales, H. G. Quaritch. - Siamese State Ceremonies, their history and function. London: Quaritch, 1931.

Warnakulasuriya, W. A. - 'Inscriptional evidence bearing on the nature of religious endowments in ancient Ceylon'. University of Ceylon Review, vol. I, 1943, pp. 69-74; vol. II, 1944, pp. 74-82, 92-96.

Weber, Max. - Essays in Sociology. Edited and translated by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. Fourth impression. London, 1961.

Wickremasinghe, Martin - 'Identification of Sīgiriya paintings'. Modern Review, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 29-32. Calcutta, 1935.

_____ - 'Sīgiriya, fortress or abode of a God-king'. New Lanka, vol. no. IV, July 1950, pp. 39-44. Colombo.

Wickremasinghe, S. - 'The Age of Parākramabāhu'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958.

Wijesekara, Nandadeva. - 'Fresh light on the Sīgiriya frescoes'. Buddhist, vol. XVI, no. 5, Sept. 1945, pp. 38-39.

_____ - 'The historical background of Sinhalese foreign relations from the earliest times to the 12th century A.D.'. The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. I, no. 3, 1952, pp. 172-191.

Wijetunga, W. M. K. - 'The Rise and Decline of Cola Power in Ceylon'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1962.

Wittfogel, Karl A. - Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power. New Haven: Yale University Press, third printing, 1959.

Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias etc.

Edgerton, F. - Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series). 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Geiger, W. - A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language. Colombo, 1938.

Goonetileke, H. A. I. - A Bibliography of Ceylon. 2 vols. Switzerland: Inter Documentation Company AG ZUG, 1970.

Hastings, J. (ed.) - Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. 12 vols. Edinburgh, 1908-1926.

Malalasekera, G. P. - Dictionary of Pali Proper Names. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1937-1938.

_____ (ed.) - Encyclopaedia of Buddhism. Colombo, 1961.

Monier Williams (ed.). - A Sanskrit English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.

Rhys Davids, T. W. and Stede, William. (eds.) - Pali - English Dictionary. London: The Pali Text Society, 1925.

Sircar, D. C. - Indian Epigraphical Glossary. Delhi, 1966.

Sorata Thera, W. - Srī Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya. 2 vols. Colombo, 1952-1956.

Still, John. - Index to the Mahāvaṁsa together with chronological table of wars and genealogical trees. Colombo, 1907.

Turner, R. L. - A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.